THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Some time ago Sir James Baillie, late Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds, contributed a striking article to the Hibbert Journal which is now published under the title of *Spiritual Religion* (Allen & Unwin; 1s. net). It is a fine testament to his faith, and as such it will be cherished by his former friends. But it is of wider interest to the thoughtful public. For here we see a philosophic mind of the first quality turning to the contemplation of the highest theme, and the treatment of it given here is marked not only by lucidity and firmness of thought but by true religious fervour.

Religion is 'a self-contained form of experience, essentially different from any other; one which can and must be cultivated for its own sake; which has its own conditions, its own processes, and its own end; and which cannot be explained away or explained in terms of some different kind of experience.' This is what many fail to realize. They suppose that religion must wait upon the verdict of science or philosophy, that it must be established by some historical inquiry or theological argument. But this is to make it a secondary and dependent thing. Religion makes its claim upon us in its own right just as morality and beauty do. We do not make our appreciation of beauty or music wait on some previously accepted theory of art. We do not first formulate a theory of morality before we undertake the duties of the moral life. So the religious instinct in man is primary and ineradicable.

Now if religious experience is thus independent and unique, distinct from moral or æsthetic or scientific experience as these are distinct from one another, its aims and processes may be studied independently of these, and the contribution it makes to the sum of human experience assessed. There are three questions which may be asked: 'What is the purpose of spiritual religion? What is its procedure? And what are the essential conditions by which its purpose is secured and its procedure maintained?'

The purpose of religion is the attainment of peace with God, that peace which comes when the finite mind enters into conscious harmony with the Divine Spirit. 'It is the spiritual correlate in man's life of the divine changelessness amidst change, of the "central peace subsisting at the heart of endless agitation" in the rolling stream of events constituting the course of the world. Whether it is a gift of the Divine, or an acquisition of man's religious efforts, does not for the moment concern us. The point for the present is that this is the primary purpose which man has in view in spiritual religion, and towards this all the experiences of spiritual religion are directed. It is the pearl of great price for which a man will give all—his predilections, his prejudices, his pride, his affections. Its possession is that in which his spiritual safety, his "salvation" consists.'

Further, what is the procedure by which this

purpose of spiritual religion is attained? The essence of it is 'a process of conscious intercommunication between finite spirit and Divine Spirit, and is carried on in terms of fellowship.' This communion of spirits is dependent on Nature for its means, and uses the resources of Nature. 'The organism in which the finite spirit is embodied, with its various sense functions, in particular the function of speech; the facts and processes of the natural world; the actions and events which make up human history—these in all their endless variety and wonderful extent are utilized by the spirit for the purpose of putting into language and realizing in action and feeling the presence of the Divine Spirit, and for expressing to itself and to others its communings with the Divine.' This communion is conducted on the plane of the moral life as well as on the plane of art in all its forms. 'But the very fact of man's failure in the moral life, his mistakes, his evil, and his sins, calls for some experience which will secure his peace in spite of these defects; and that experience is found in his communion with the Divine which is able to transcend his errors, to forgive his sins, and thus reconcile man to the Divine Life whose perfection man seeks to share and by sharing to find fulfilment.'

There remains the question of what are the essential conditions in and through which this communion is sustained. 'The remoteness of the Divine Spirit from man might indeed justify silence on the part of God. But in spiritual religion it is held, and experience can alone verify the fact, that the Divine Spirit does communicate with man, does disclose His mind and will. 'In what way or ways, then, is man able to break through or break in upon the august silence of God?'

The answer is, along the path of Faith and Hope and Love. First comes Faith by which man's spirit affirms as triumphant and ultimately attainable, if not in time then in eternity, the supreme ends of his life. 'Faith is not mere belief but a form of communion with the Divine, carried on from hour to hour and day to day; and the Divine Spirit communicates His life to man in and through Faith. The peace it produces is the correlative of Faith and that peace is the peace of God.' Then comes Hope which concerns itself with the future. 'Hope is that frame of mind in which man, by his union with the Divine, realizes in anticipation the ends he continues to pursue.' It is this Hope which gives rise to the conviction of Immortality. The final and highest stage of communion is Love, a form of communion difficult to attain and to express. 'Love brings the very life of the Divine into the soul of man and takes it as its own. . . . The Divine Spirit becomes the unchanging friend, the intimate companion, carrying on close and eternal fellowship with the finite spirit in perpetual reciprocal intercourse of thought and action and desire.' This intimacy would seem to involve on God's side a desire to enter in the fullest possible way into human life and the temporal struggle. This leads naturally to the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation with its sequence in the Resurrection.

Much of all this is true and nobly expressed. The only criticism one feels disposed to make is that it has less of a specifically Christian than of a Neo-Platonic ring about it. Much of it, indeed, is pure Neo-Platonism. It is anthropocentric. It is based on man's restless desire for God. God is sought for the satisfying of man's desire. The story is of man's ascent to God through faith, hope, and love, rather than of God's descent to sinful man in His infinite and unmerited grace. Communion with God is regarded as being open to man through his native kinship with God and on terms that suggest a certain equality. There is little recognition of sin as the mighty barrier which must be removed ere communion is possible. Naturally, therefore, there is no mention whatever of the Cross, and it is doubtful if the real nature of the Divine Love is apprehended. Man's love to God and God's love to man are spoken of in the same breath as cognate. Man desires God, and God desires man, and therefore must become incarnate. Plato was more logical. Starting from this conception of love as a desire to possess and enjoy, he argued that love of man towards God is possible and right, for man seeks his highest good in God, but God can experience no such desire; for He already enjoys in Himself perfect blessedness to the full. Therefore

love of God to man is illogical and Incarnation unthinkable. No, the exposition in the New Testament of God's redeeming love to sinful man moves along quite other lines.

It has been claimed that a knowledge of Calvinism is a help to the right appreciation of modern movements in theology, politics, and social life. But, whatever be the cause of it, there has certainly been in our modern world a revival of interest in Calvinism. In Hungary there has recently appeared a translation of the 1536 (the original) edition of the *Institutes*. Also a new French translation has been issued, and the first volume of a German translation. Nor have the biographers been idle.

In order to appreciate in particular the Barthian movement in theology a knowledge of Calvinism is desirable. For Karl Barth, who gives the name to this movement of the new conservatism, strikes many of the fundamental notes of Calvin's theology. And he does it, as a recent writer has said, with 'a power of statement which is capable of striking into the world of current theological thinking with disturbing if not quickening power.' He might have gone further and said the Barthian movement has actually done so.

The writer above quoted is A. DAKIN, B.D., D.Theol., President of Bristol Baptist College. The quotation is from the volume he has contributed to the useful 'Duckworth's Theology Series': *Calvinism* (Duckworth; 5s. net).

It is a comprehensive volume. The first half of it is devoted to an exposition of Calvinism as a dogmatic system. The exposition is based on the text of the *Institutes*, and is carefully done, with illuminating comment in places. Then follows a treatment of Calvinism as an ecclesiastical system. Beginning with an account of the theory of organization as set forth in the *Institutes*, it goes on to show how Calvinism worked out in ecclesiastical and civil polity on the Continent of Europe and in the English-speaking world, both in Britain and in America. The third part discusses certain salient aspects of Calvinism: its views of Scripture, of the seat of religious authority, of the social order, of the relation of Church and State, and its way of life. It concludes with some observations on the revived interest in Calvinism.

This revived interest is due in part to the spread of the Barthian movement, which is in agreement with so much of the Reformer's thought. Both Calvin and Barth are theocentric in their approach to theology, being both opposed to the anthropocentrism of the humanisms they respectively encounter. For both there can be no discovery of God or knowledge of Him apart from His own self-revelation. This disability, or rather inability, is traced by both to the Fall.

Other points of agreement might readily be mentioned, but Dr. DAKIN rightly says that the Barthian theology is not Calvinism but a neo-Calvinism (that is, in so far it is Calvinistic). And he points out certain limitations in Calvin's views that modern theology should transcend, while at the same time conserving the evangelical elements so profoundly present in Calvin. For example, Christian thought will never again put the Decalogue on a level with the Sermon on the Mount, or state the doctrine of predestination in so rigorous and austere a fashion.

Let us observe in concluding that although his doctrine of predestination might give another impression, Calvin lived at the inmost heart and centre of the Christian faith. It is worth recalling what he says in the *Institutes*, in reference to the gospel: 'It is not a doctrine of tongue, but of life; and is not conceived as other learnings be, with only understanding and memory, but is then only received when it possesseth the whole soul, and findeth a seat and place to hold it in the most inward affection of the heart.'

The subject of the latest Hale Memorial sermon is *The Place of Nationalism in Religion*, and it was delivered by the Archbishop of Brisbane (Seabury-

Western Thelogical Seminary, Evanston, Illinois; 25 cents). It is part of the genius of the Anglican Communion, says Dr. WAND, to develop its organization in the form of national churches. There are the Church of Ireland, the Church in Wales, the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and the distinct and independent churches of China, India, and Japan. The only administrative point of contact between these various national churches lies in the decennial conference of the Bishops at Lambeth; and that has no legal but only a moral authority.

On anthropological grounds there seems no doubt that nationalism has a real and important part to play in religion. Certainly that is what has happened. Each nation had its own religion, its own gods, its own system of worship. In regard to the Church the evidence is not so clear. We must, of course, remember that the Church does not begin with the New Testament. Throughout the Old Testament Israel and the Church are one. The nation is the Church. And the first generation of Christians claimed to be the New, as well as the True, Israel. But facts undeceived them. The Christian Church soon found itself bereft of all national rights. It became a voluntary association. And it was not till the reign of Theodosius the Great that the Church was established as the State religion, and the position in the Old Testament was reproduced on the Christian level.

Dr. WAND rapidly surveys the events of the following centuries, maintaining that even before the Reformation the English Church was in a real sense national, with what he calls a 'modified nationalism,' and the Reformation made this more of a reality. But the real interest of the Archbishop's lecture emerges when he comes to discuss the present situation. He contends that the Church of England can still claim to be a national Church; not in the sense that all the citizens subscribe to its faith and share in its life, but in the sense that it represents, both in its faults and in its virtues, a typically English expression of Christianity. It still continues to represent the Christian faith of the nation as a whole.

What then does nationalism stand for? And what does it contribute to the common stock of faith? There can be no doubt, to begin with, that the younger Christian churches can, and do, make a real contribution to the understanding of our religion. The natural genius of each individual race expresses itself in Christian thought and worship. The specimens of Christian art produced in these churches do bring an enrichment of the spirit and a fuller illumination of that faith which we have long practised. And, if in art, why not in theology?

Dr. WAND is inevitably led at this point to ask what effect nationalism in religion may have on the world's present struggle towards international unity. If this is to be achieved, the present tendency towards exaggerated political nationalism will have to be checked. The various States will have to surrender some element of their full independent sovereignty. Dr. WAND doubts whether anything other than religion will be able to produce such a conversion, or to help the creation of an atmosphere of mutual goodwill in which alone the hope of peace or international unity can arise.

What part can our national churches play in this movement? They can play their part by becoming international. They must recognize themselves ever more clearly as integral parts of one world-wide Communion. They need not forfeit their national character by submitting to one central source of organization or to one fount of jurisdiction. But they must realize fully that they are part of the Catholic Church. Dr. WAND suggests that the churches of the Anglican Communion afford an almost ideal example of this kind of unity. They have each their own customs, but their ministry and method of worship, their belief and practices, are the same. Would not this very unity, transferred to the political sphere, solve the urgent and critical international problem?

'I believe,' says Dr. WAND, 'that in this respect the work that we have been doing during the present century for Christian Reunion will be seen to take on a new and enhanced importance. In the ecclesi-

astical history of the last four hundred years two movements stand out with remarkable clarity, the missionary expansion of the nineteenth century and the reunion movement of the twentieth. In both of these God has permitted us to take a leading part. . . . It is almost inevitable that the ecclesiastical *rapprochement* should assist in the development of more friendly secular co-operation between the nations.'

And now Dr. WAND comes to very concrete business. If the Anglican national churches are to exercise the influence on the world of which they are capable, they must make themselves more efficient. Dr. WAND points to certain glaring defects and outlines certain suggestions for bettering matters. One is the need of a church ministry of information. In England almost nothing is known of the Church overseas, except the missionary dioceses. And the separate churches know little of one another. It is true that once in ten years, at the decennial conferences, these churches are made aware of one another and of the great world-wide Anglican Communion. But memories are short, and an exiguous Continuation Committee can do little to fill the long ten years' gap.

When the Report of the Doctrinal Commission was published in England the first information of its contents that reached the Church in Australia was contained in the scare headlines of the newspapers. When the public turned to the Bishops for fuller and more expert handling they were in no position to supply it until two months had elapsed. Another instance of this lack occurred at the outbreak of the present war. The people overseas expected to be given special opportunities for united prayer, and they would have been glad to have joined in the same forms of service that were being used by their brethren in England. But these were so long in reaching Australia that the authorities there had to compile and publish services of their own.

But a closer bond is needed than the mere spread of mutual knowledge can effect. There ought to be a much more vital and personal interest in each other's concerns than exists at present. Something can be done by interchange among both clergy and laity. But a system is called for that will be more definite, official and permanent. In secular affairs this is being done by the appointment of permanent officials of one country at the government and trade headquarters of another. Could not the Church adopt a similar policy, and send to the overseas churches men corresponding to the Agents General and High Commissioners who do so much to bind the Empire together?

By means of such a spiritual diplomatic corps insularity would be broken down, and the accumulated wisdom and experience of the whole Church could be easily and rapidly applied to the circumstances of each church. This would be a logical development of the true principle of nationalism. It would prevent a drift to practical separatism. It would add greatly to the value of the Lambeth Conferences. And it would make the national churches, thus bound together by real ties, a more potent influence in world affairs.

The Character of the Prophetic Literature.

By Professor Dr. Joh. Lindblom, Lund University, Sweden.

By prophetic literature I mean the longer or shorter writings in the Old Testament that bear the name of some prophet of old Israel: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, Hosea, etc. There was a time when these books were thought of as books in the modern sense, literary works written by a single author with a certain plan. Opinions were divided about these authors and the way in which they worked. Some saw in them divinely inspired writers who wrote in ecstasy under the guidance of the Spirit; others saw in them primarily artists urged by a feeling like that which urges poets.

But there are many circumstances which prevent us from looking upon a prophetic book of the Old Testament as upon an ordinary, modern book.

In the first place many of the prophetic books completely lack what we usually call plan and order, both from the factual and chronological points of view. For example, let us take a look at the Book of Isaiah. The passage that according to our notion should have begun the book, the passage about the calling of the prophet, does not stand in the beginning as an introduction to the book, but as ch. 6 well on into the book. Instead the introduction is formed by a section, which, according to a common notion among exegetists, dates from the end of the prophet Isaiah's life, from the time about 701, when the Assyrian armies under Sennacherib had captured and devastated Judea, and Jerusalem 'was left like a booth in a vineyard, like a hut in a cucumber field.' After the account of Isaiah's calling about 740 in ch. 6, there follows immediately a section from the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic War about 734 in ch. 7. The speeches Isaiah made between his calling and this time must be sought in various parts of the Book of Isaiah.

Another peculiarity of the prophetic books which speaks against their having been written in one piece, is that in part they contain sections in which the prophet himself speaks in the first person, in part sections in which another person tells something about the prophet, and so speaks of him in the third person. In ch. 6 the prophet Isaiah tells of how his call came: 'In the year that king Uzziah died I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up,' etc., but in ch. 7 another person tells of the famous meeting between Isaiah and King Ahaz in the year 734: 'Then said the Lord unto Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz,' etc.

This alternation of first and third person is very important in the Book of Hosea. As we know, this prophet had a very tragical marriage, in which he saw a symbol of the ruined connexion between Yahweh and his people. We have two separate accounts of this marriage, one in ch. 1, and a second in ch. 3. The first is an account by a friend or disciple, who speaks of Hosea in the third person; the second is by the prophet himself, speaking in the first person: 'The Lord said to *me*.' In my opinion, which is also that of Prof. Robinson of Cardiff ('*Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten*' in Eissfeldt's *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*), these two accounts should be considered as two parallel accounts of the same thing, though from somewhat different aspects. The impression we get from the text in our Bible, that ch. 3 is a continuation of ch. 1, and that the prophet thus married an unchaste woman twice, is due to the editor of the Book of the prophet Hosea having corrected the text to give that impression. Thus I am not of the same opinion as Prof. Budde and Prof. Sellin, who think this alternation of 'I' and 'he' is due to an imperfectly carried out revision, intended to change all the first person accounts into third person accounts without exception. According to these scholars, the prophets once wrote autobiographies, which in part were mutilated and included in our present prophetic books only in fragments, in part were revised into third person accounts. There are not sufficient reasons for such an assumption. The tendency of the revisers was not to decrease the historical material, but rather to increase it. It is on account of the Word of God, the Oracle, that we have the original notes, not on account of their anecdotal nature. Thus the Word of God, not the historical account, is the nucleus of the prophetic literature. And therefore the alternation of first and third person accounts is already a feature of the oldest collections.

A third factor of importance for the understanding of the prophetic books of the Old Testament is that they contain not only speeches and sermons by the prophet who gives his name to the book, but also a quantity of other material from other prophets and other periods incorporated with the authentic material. We usually distinguish Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah from Proto-Isaiah. But the book we call Proto-Isaiah is also anything but uniform. Besides other sections by alien hands, we have, above

all, the section chs. 24–27, the so-called Isaiah Apocalypse, which in my opinion is in its original form a cantata, sung at a festival in Jerusalem after the conquest of Babylon by the Persian King Xerxes in 485 B.C. The reason why the cantata was put into the Book of Isaiah is partly that the conquest of Babylon in that year was thought to be a fulfilment of the numerous prophecies of Babylon's fall in the Book of Isaiah, partly that the cantata has imitated Isaiah's language and style in a very striking way (Joh. Lindblom, *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse; Jes.* 24–27, Lund, 1938).

What has been said here of the Book of Isaiah is largely true of other prophetic books. So our result is as follows. Our prophetic books are not books in the modern sense, written in one piece by one author, but collections of prophetic texts; at times, too, collections of collections of prophetic texts, as we see, *e.g.* from the composition of the very inclusive Book of Isaiah in its present form. We call the men who put together our present prophetic books collectors. The first collectors were the prophet's own friends and disciples, who gathered what was accessible of their master's preaching. The primary collections that arose from this have afterwards been subjected to further editing. They have been provided with all kinds of headings, they have been gathered into bigger collections, sometimes according to a certain general plan, as we see particularly clearly in the Books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. They have been supplemented by historical sections to make plain the historical conditions in which the prophet lived and worked.

The question we shall now try to answer is this: How shall we take the original components of a prophetic book, the prophetic 'speeches,' 'sermons,' 'messages'?

A common mistake from which we must liberate ourselves is that the prophets were primarily authors, men of the desk and the pen, writers in the modern sense. Of course the prophets *may* very well have written—the art of writing in old Israel is much older than the prophets—and in many cases, too, they have written. Thus we know that Isaiah once inscribed some symbolic words on a tablet (8). At another time he was commanded to write down his revelations in a book (30^8). This is also told of Habakkuk (2^2). In these cases they wrote so that it might afterwards prove that they spoke the truth, and that they were thus real prophets. Jeremiah wrote a letter to the deportees at Babylon (29). The intimate confessions that we still have here and there in the prophetic books are best understood as notes by the prophets themselves. And yet the main task of the prophets was not to write. Usually others wrote for them, if not for a shorter or longer time their revelations were transmitted only in the oral tradition. In one case we know for certain that a prophet had a special secretary; in the Book of Jeremiah it is mentioned that Jeremiah had a scribe, Baruch, who wrote the prophet's words down.

Then, what was the main task of the prophets? It was primarily to receive divine revelations. In the second place, it was their task to clothe their revelations in words, and to communicate them to other people as messages from God. A prophetic revelation is in the beginning something purely internal, nothing that has to do with pen and desk. A revelation is a matter between the prophet and his God. The revelation can have been made to him in various circumstances. Sometimes it came while he was sitting in solitude, sometimes when he stood praying in the sanctuary. Sometimes it came when he was among listening friends or intimates, sometimes while he stood out among the people gathered at the city gate, in the market, at the holy places in the provinces, or in the Temple forecourt at Jerusalem.

It is said of Jeremiah that, while he was in prison, King Zedekiah had him brought before him and asked, 'Is there any word from the Lord?' Jeremiah answered, 'There is: thou shalt be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon' (Jer 37^{15-17}). It is thus assumed here that the prophet could receive his revelations in prison. This is plainly so of those revelations that in the first place do not concern other persons, but only the prophet himself, revelations about his call and his inner life, in the form of talk between God and the prophet, or in the form of what we may call prophetic confessions. Isaiah received his first revelation standing in the sanctuary at Jerusalem (6). Ezekiel received a revelation sitting in his house, the elders of the Jews sitting with him (8). Amos received a number of his revelations in Bethel, watching the sacrifices and the crowds celebrating their cult.

Whatever the circumstances of the revelations, it is in accordance with Hebrew mentality that a prophet did not keep anything to himself, but was driven to tell others what had been revealed to him. The Hebrew mind is not meditative and passive, but extremely active and extrospective. And it was part of a prophet's calling to bring God's word to his people. He was a watchman over his people, a warner, a judge, or an encourager and comforter. In this consciousness the prophet had of his calling lay an impulse to publish what he had himself received. The prophet's revelations could become

public in three ways. First, they could be written down on a sheet of papyrus or parchment and sent round as leaflets among the people, or they could also be communicated orally to the person the revelation most concerned. We have an example of this in the oracles that the prophet Jeremiah told to King Zedekiah, or Isaiah told King Ahaz. Then, they could be given as public speeches or sermons before gathered crowds. These speeches, delivered by word of mouth, and of course originally improvised in a state of powerful inspiration, might in a later time be written down and so pass to posterity. The bearing in mind and the writing down was made easier because the prophetic speeches usually had a strict poetic form. They were therefore easy to learn by heart, and could thus readily be kept in mind, until at last they were written down.

The formulation of a revelation always has difficulties. The more intellectual the content, the more easily can it be expressed in human words and ideas : the nearer the revelation approaches a real vision, the more difficult it is to imprison it in a fixed form. The revelation made the world of the ineffable accessible to the prophet. With his mind's eye he beheld in the vision sights from the world hidden from ordinary people. God Himself and the heavenly things appeared to him in indescribable majesty. He had to give a plastic form to what he saw. The ineffable had to be expressed in words. A feeling had to be adequately expressed and formed in comprehensible images.

In certain cases we can notice that a revelation underwent certain changes when written down. When a literary revelation is filled with descriptions of the prophet's own state of mind, his anguish and terror, his amazement before the vision, this is clearly due to subsequent reflection, and has been put into the description of the vision afterwards. An example is Is 21, which recounts a vision that a prophet had about the imminent conquest of Babylon by the Persians. 'It makes me writhe with anguish, with pangs like a woman in travail ; I cannot hear for pain, I cannot see for the shock ; my brain is reeling, the horror appals me '—this is not part of the immediate rendering of the vision, but of the literary form given to it. In the moment of vision the visionary is always more taken up with what he sees and hears than with what he feels himself.

Sometimes different visions are stylized quite similarly, and this too is due to the literary formulation. A pretty large number of descriptions of visions are in the form of a conversation between God and the prophet, according to the following plan : The Lord showed me this . . . The Lord said What do you see ? . . . I said . . . And the Lord said to me (and then follows the interpretation of the vision). We have this form in Amos, Jeremiah, and Zechariah.

In symbolic visions, symbol and reality have sometimes been mingled in the formulation, just as is often so with the parables of Jesus. In the account of the vision whereby Isaiah received his call, he speaks of his unclean lips long before he at all knew that he was to be called to be a preacher of God's word. And similarly, his lips are purified by a red-hot stone from the altar, before it was plain that he would need to use them in the service of the divine word. Probably it was originally only a question of the uncleanness in general of the prophet and his people. Afterwards, when the vision was written down, the prophet knew that it was from the beginning a matter of his call to be a preacher of the holy word of God, and so it was all concentrated on the lips as organs of speech.

It is nowadays common for the Old Testament scholars in Germany to inquire into the different 'Gattungen' of Old Testament literature, *i.e.* the different literary kinds of categories in the Old Testament. We may ask : What is the literary 'Gattung' of the prophetic literature ? We are here not thinking primarily of the 'Gattungen' of the separate prophetic speeches, but of the literature of the prophets as a whole. Are there any analogies in world-literature ? Have we prophetic literature in other parts of the world ?

Prophetic literature is to be found everywhere where a man or woman has written down or has had written down revelations received in a state of powerful inspiration or ecstasy, with the aim of influencing others. The Koran is prophetic literature in this sense. Muhammad was a typical prophet, and the older in particular of the Suras in the Koran are ecstatic revelations that have been written down. Christianity too has a prophetic literature. I should like to draw the reader's attention to a prophetic personality in my own country, in Sweden, who has much in common with the prophets of Israel, and has left a very considerable collection of writings, which in many cases show similarities to the prophetic books of the Old Testament. I mean the mediæval Swedish saint, Bridget of Vadstena, who lived in the fourteenth century. I cannot say much about Bridget herself here, but I shall say something about her books, because they can throw light on the origin of the prophetic books of the Old Testament.

We know fairly well how the revelations of St.

Bridget became literature. She has told us about it herself in various passages of her writings, and her friends have told about it. We find that Bridget sometimes wrote down her revelations herself, sometimes dictated them to others. Among Bridget's writings there is one called 'Sermo angelicus,' the Angel's Sermon. It came about in the following way. Bridget sat down and waited for inspiration. She sat down with her pen in her hand and a sheet before her, as if prepared to receive the revelations when they came. As she sat there, fully prepared, inspiration came. The angel, she says, dictated to her clearly and plainly in her own language. And she wrote everything down as he spoke, and afterwards showed it to her father-confessors.

It happened otherwise when, also in a state of inspiration or ecstasy, Bridget received the rule for the nunnery in Vadstena. She says of it that she first received it from God, and then dictated it to a friend of God, who wrote it down from her dictation, as fast as ever he could.

Among Bridget's revelations there are many about other persons, heavenly messages that she was to pass on for comfort or in judgment. In the biography of Bridget written by her father-confessors, Petrus of Skenninge and Petrus of Alvastra, we have a detailed description of how these messages received a literary form. The biography says she used to write down the words given her in inspiration (*verba divinatus ei data*) with her own hand. But she might also summons a secretary and dictate the content of the revelation, often being strongly moved, or even in tears, and in a state of exalted devotion and spiritual elevation, solemnly, as if she had read from a sacred book. Afterwards she carefully checked and corrected what had been written, and then the message was sent to the person concerned.

So we see that this prophetess sometimes wrote down her revelations herself, sometimes dictated them to her intimates, though always under strict control. We also note that the dictated form was produced in inspiration as much as the actual conception in the moment of revelation.

Bridget's revelations were written down in books or sent as messages to the individuals concerned, but we also hear of another way in which they were spread: they were sent about, while she was still alive, in the form of separate leaflets, which people read. While the Saint was living in Rome at the end of her life, the whole city was filled with her circulated revelations, where she chastised the population of the metropolis for their sins, and threatened them with the judgment of God. They were read with abhorrence or with fear. Some saw in her a messenger of God, others a false prophet or a sorceress.

Similar things are also told of other mediæval mystics. We learn of Hildegard of Bingen that at first she tried to silence her revelations, so that no one else might share in them. But she thereby fell into a state of inner unrest and anxiety, that made her weak and ill. This state did not pass until she obeyed the deepest urge of her conscience and ceased to resist. Then she wrote down herself what she saw and heard, or else dictated it, like Bridget, to her intimates. Mechthild of Hackeborn often kept her revelations back, partly through modesty, partly because she could not express what she had seen in ordinary human speech. But she announced some revelations openly to all who came to her. Others she shared with her most intimate friends. They wrote down what they had heard without Mechthild's having the least idea of it for a long time. She was very distressed when she heard of it, but felt comforted when she was certain that God wished it so. Thus the greater part of the book of Mechthild's revelations was completed during her lifetime. It was read to her and corrected by her. Some part was added after her death from what her survivors remembered.

The nun Gertrude of Helfta heard that she should not leave the prison of the body before she had also paid the mite that she still kept back, namely, the writing down of her revelations. She realized that her oral pronouncements were of benefit only to those present, but the written word might bring about the salvation of many. She found it very difficult to get the right form when writing down. When she was to write, the abundance of her inspiration overwhelmed her so, that only with extreme difficulty she could give human expression to what she had felt. But then came a period when the flood of inspiration flowed so slowly and gently that she could write down what came upon her without trouble, just as if it were something that she had long had in her thoughts. Mechthild of Magdeburg wrote down her revelations with her own hand. Elizabeth of Schoenau told her brother her revelations: he edited them and gave them the form they now have. Suso's experiences were written down by his friend Elsbeth Stagel, etc.

So we hear everywhere of brothers and sisters, friends, father-confessors, who have stood by the side of the persons receiving revelation, and served them as secretaries, or afterwards written down what they remembered.

I have told rather more about this to give a picture of the way in which revelations have become literature all over the world. And this is in essence what happened in the time of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, and Amos, too.

The comparison of the Old Testament prophets with the mediæval mystics is valid only for the literary kind and the human psychological basis on which this literature is founded. They are similar because the prophets of Israel, like the mediæval mystics we have spoken of, were ecstatics, and received their inspirations in the form of visions and revelations, in a state of powerful inspiration. There follows upon this similarity of psychological condition a great similarity in the way the literature founded on the revelations came about. Both the prophetic books of the Old Testament and the books of the mediæval mystics are 'revelation-literature' in their general literary type. And so a study of the literature of revelation in the Middle Ages may throw much light upon the prophetic books of the Old Testament.

But with this similarity we must not pass by the essential dissimilarities. In the first place, as already indicated, it does not seem that the Old Testament prophets felt any temptation to keep their revelations to themselves. This is primarily bound up with the peculiar consciousness of their call that the Old Testament prophets had. The prophet knew from the beginning that he had a task to perform for his people. It never occurred to him that he received his revelations for his own sake, for his own edification, for his own pleasure. He knew from the very first that he was God's messenger to the people of Israel. Ecstasies, revelations, and visions, did not serve his own personal life of devotion, but were simply means for the carrying out of the calling of prophetic preacher. That is why the prophets never seem to have been tempted to keep back their revelations from others. It was otherwise with the mediæval mystics. For them ecstasies and visions were an organic part of their devotional life. In ecstasy and revelation they experienced the summit of personal religion. They regarded their extraordinary experiences as a proof of God's grace to them personally, as a private matter between them and their God. Only when on account of its content a revelation proved to concern some one else, did its publication become a natural thing. In just this aversion to the making known of their revelations to wider circles, the great mass of mediæval mystics show that they follow the line of religion as a pleasure or *fruitus Dei*, a line that runs as far from the religion of the prophets as is at all possible.

The prophets felt from the beginning that they were preachers. Therefore to keep their revelations secret would have been a contradiction. Even the most intimate and personal of the revelations were included in the preaching, as Jeremiah's intimate confessions from his private relation to God show. Jeremiah also had his temptations. But these were not about the publication of the revelations, rather about the to be or not to be of the prophetic call. We see this from the remarkable ch. 20 of his book. Jeremiah suffered exceedingly in the practice of his prophetic call. He had to live as a solitary man, isolated from the life of the people. He had to stand temptations. He was imprisoned, and his life was threatened. He had to go about with the reputation of traitor. No wonder that now and again the temptation came upon him to cease to be a prophet and to go back to private life. It is just this kind of temptation that the prophet describes in ch. 20 of his book: 'I said: I will not speak in his name any more, but then it was in my heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was tired of this, so tired that I could not bear it any longer.' The anxiety and anguish that it caused the prophet to be disobedient to his God was too great. He could not stand it, and so he returned once more to the way of the prophetic call.

It is very remarkable that Jeremiah let his people share these intimate experiences. Why was it? Because everything that he experienced he experienced not merely for his own sake, but for the sake of his people. The prophets of Israel did not belong to themselves, but to God and their people, and so they passed on all that they experienced in their life with God, they passed it on as messages from the inner world in which they lived. We call such passages prophetic confessions. Our prophetic books contain both such prophetic confessions, and direct messages to the people. The prophets regarded each of these kinds as revelations, and so they had to make both kinds public.

The other main difference between the prophets of Israel and the mystics of the Middle Ages, was, that the religion of the mystics was *mysticism*, whereas the religion of the prophets was a *belief in the God of history*. The mystics' religion is based on 'introspection' or 'introversion.' They think they find God within them, they think they can reach God through contemplation and meditation, through going deeper and deeper into their own soul. The prophets never meant nor thought this. For them the place for God's revelation was the outer life.

They never referred their listeners to the experiences of the inner life, to the emotional impulses of the soul, but to God's guidance in the history of Israel, from the delivery out of Egypt right up to the time in which they themselves lived. The religion of the prophets is a belief in and a submission to a God who met mankind objectively, out in the great stretches of events in the history of the world. The mystics closed their doors and windows and drew their curtains, and plunged into their own interior. They thought they found God there.

The difference between the prophets of Israel and the mediæval mystics lies in the kind of consciousness they have of their call, and in the kind of actual religion. But the similarity of the psychological forms in which revelation is received, and the similarity of the purely literary nature of their writings, are undeniable.

A characteristic of all revelation literature, wherever we come across it, is that the collections of revelations have not usually been completed at once, but in many stages. The composition may have lasted for long periods. Often many different hands have contributed. What is there and what is not there may often be due to chance. In this way it has often resulted that a collection of revelations exhibits great lack of coherence, plan, and order. One notes that there must be gaps, from the fact that a revelation presupposes something that is not there at all. The indications of situation are often defective and hazy. The chronological order is unsatisfactory, and the arrangement of the whole difficult or impossible to get clear.

It is also typical for revelation literature that attempts may be found here and there to bring about greater completeness and clarity. Additions and supplements of greater or less extent have been made. They may have been made at the first transmission by oral tradition or at the first writing down, or afterwards by publishers or editors. Sometimes these additions may serve as historical introductions, or indications of situation that tell when or for what reason that and that revelation was made. Sometimes they may consist of new material contributed by other persons, etc.

Thus revelation is primarily something secret and personal. It has its origin in the inmost life of the soul, in the most intimate intercourse with God; but the content may become public. It may be told by word of mouth, or it may be written down in the form of letters, messages, leaflets, or notes somewhat like books. Finally, the revelations may be collected into bigger units. Thus we get large literary works containing revelations. The revelations have become literature.

We see from what has been said about the extra-biblical literature of revelation, that it corresponds point for point with the characteristics of the prophetic literature of the Old Testament. Our thesis is thus as follows: *the prophetic literature of the Old Testament belongs to the general literary type that we term revelation-literature.* In order to understand the writings of the Old Testament prophets better, it is thus of great importance to study carefully the extra-biblical literature of ecstatic revelation.

The prophetic literature, considered as typical revelation-literature, as collections of prophetic revelation that have gradually arisen, confronts the Old Testament scholar with very complicated problems.

The first thing he has to do is to divide the text into the original units, so that the separate revelations lie clear, and are set apart from one another. Then he has to purify them from all kinds of later and alien additions. Then he has to find out which revelations are authentic for a certain prophet, and which come from other hands or other times. Finally, it is his task to try and determine the time and historical background of these various revelations, where this is possible. Not until all this has been done can a complete and coherent picture of the particular prophet's message, personality, and thought be given. And in this way one may at last obtain a clear notion of the Word of God, that it was the task of this prophet to bring to his time and to ours.

The Historic Church and Present Need.

III. The Early Church and the Younger Churches.

By Professor John Foster, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

As a student of history I have lately been stirred with a deep discontent at failure to appreciate the significance of the modern missionary movement. If you are a medievalist you cannot neglect the Church. It is so central in society, so decisive in economics, so intertwined with political situations. Nothing is wholly secular. But take the *Cambridge Modern History*, which covers the period from the Renaissance down to *c.* 1900. Look up 'missionary' in Volume XIII, the Index to the twelve which have gone before. You will find one reference, 'Missionary Ridge; fighting at, 1863.' It is an obscure place in Tennessee, scene of a skirmish during the American Civil War. Having drawn a blank there, try one of the great societies. I tried 'London Missionary Society.' This is more hopeful: The references are three. Two again concern, not battles, but minor incidents connected with the Boer War. The third looks more impressive. It occurs on a page where the headline runs, 'Niger problem solved—Livingstone.' But mistake it not: It is only the source of the Niger River, not the enlightening of the Dark Continent.

No one would expect preferential treatment of religion from the secular historian. But it is time to protest against a neglect of religious facts[1] which is itself a falsification of history. From 1792 onwards begins the Missionary Awakening. In England five of the great societies are founded within ten years. Within fifty all the foremost missionary agencies of the British Isles, of the Protestant churches of the Continent of Europe, and of the United States of America, are in the field. In the Roman communion missionary zeal revives and reaches an unprecedented pitch. There begins an expansion of the Church which is unequalled in any page of history. The *Cambridge Modern History* gives a whole volume to the French Revolution, and another to Napoleon. But there is no mention of that contemporary movement which is the greatest happening since Pentecost.

We of the churches are victims of this falsification. Congregations think of overseas missions as a special charity, like the hospitals—but more distant and peculiar—for which funds are raised as one of the Church's side-lines. Ministers regard missions as a sphere of work which drew the more romantic of their fellow theologues, whence they return to tell amusing anecdotes of the strange ways of the heathen, or sobstuff stories of his conversion, according to taste. Even in our programme of theological studies you may see it: My own chair was almost called 'Church History and the History of Missions.' I objected, and I still object. Missions are not an added extra. This thing is the life of the Church.

With this in mind examine the course of Church History. The urge of essential Christianity in the Apostolic Age carries the Church forward in an expansion which lasts three hundred years, until the Roman world submits, and the Galilean has conquered. Then through the long centuries of the Middle Ages, some of them dark, many of them dull, there are repeated revivals of the spirit of essential Christianity. The typical medieval expression of revival is a monastic movement. And the monks are the medieval missionaries.[2] You are reminded of this connexion between revival, monk, and mission by St. Benedict, the framer of that rule which decided the form to be taken by monasticism in the whole of the West. The first Benedictine house to be established, away from the Roman environment where the movement began, was that mission station of Augustine's at Canterbury. Europe was converted by monks. They were equally prominent in the Greek Church in its advance in North Africa and its entry into Russia. It was Persian monks who first took the gospel across Asia to the Far East (635).

The most significant of the later revivals is that which found expression in the Friars. This is a revival which still warms our hearts, especially as we see it in the Little Poor Man of Assisi.

[1] I am neither overlooking nor disparaging the valuable Volume II. on the Reformation, nor such occasional sections as the chapter by Gwatkin on Religious Toleration in Volume V., and the (scanty) ten pages given by Temperley to the revival in the eighteenth century in Volume VI.

[2] J. T. Addison, *The Medieval Missionary*.

St. Francis marks the re-emergence of missions into the Church of the later Middle Ages. He himself preaches before the Sultan of Egypt—when other Christians express their zeal only by fighting the Saracen. Others go to Morocco: 'Now I can truly say that I have five real brothers,' says the Saint when he hears of their martyrdom. Still more go to Persia, into the lands of the Mongols, and on to India and the Far East.

The Reformation is a revival (some would say *the* revival) of essential Christianity. It was robbed of its natural counterpart, resumption of the missionary task, by the sad fact that Protestants had a long struggle for existence. It was so long that they used up their energies in self-defence, and settled into an attitude of self-regarding. This is a fair sample of the Protestant mind:

> 'To spread abroad the knowledge of the Gospel among barbarous and heathen nations seems to be highly preposterous. . . . Whilst there remains at home a single individual without the means of religious knowledge, to propagate it abroad would be improper and absurd.' [1]

But there was one part of the sixteenth-century revival, ill-called the counter-Reformation (as though it had only negative significance!), which enabled the Church of Rome to claim the New World, and the new routes across the Old World, for Christ. Such an expansion of Christianity takes place then as has in all the centuries before never been witnessed.[2]

Finally comes the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century, which quickens the life of every communion in the British Isles. There is a contemporary revival, the Great Awakening, doing the same for North America. The Continent of Europe has already been stirred by the earlier movements of Pietists and Moravians. And lo, we are in it, belated, but not too late. The greatest missionary movement of all the Church's history has begun.[3] It still proceeds—as I have said—the greatest event since Pentecost.

Missions are the life of the Church, the expression of essential Christianity. Whenever the Church revives, it is to become again the Church preaching the gospel to every creature.

Having made these two points (1) that the Church is essentially a missionary Church, and (2) that the modern missionary movement is the biggest event since Pentecost, let me make another which fits them both together, and really illumines the whole subject of missions as nothing else does: (3) The Younger Churches are the Early Church of our day.

It is obvious once it is stated. We all recognize in the great missionary pioneers apostolic figures. We have been slower to realize that those (how did we dub them?) 'more romantic' fellow theologues who went to the mission field have anything like that significance, men of the sub-apostolic age; that the struggling churches which they seek to serve are the Early Church come to life again; that there is hardly a problem, a situation, a task, belonging to the history of the Church in the first four centuries which is not a chief pre-occupation to the men of the missionary movement to-day.

It is of vital importance that missionaries, ministers, and members of the younger churches should come to this realization. They are not facing problems for the first time. They are rich in the treasury of experience. They stand alongside saints and fathers in a Church with a heroic past. There is only one thing that matters nearly as much. It is that you of the Church at home should know what you are doing when you stand in with us on the missionary task. You are not patronizing one of the side-lines, turning from the Church's main, though humdrum, work to a refreshing romanticism. You are claiming and making real your relationship to:

> 'The glorious company of the apostles:
> The goodly fellowship of the prophets:
> The noble army of the martyrs:
> The holy Church throughout all the world.'

It would make a difference to missionary education, missionary prayer meetings, missionary giving, the flow of missionary candidates, if you of the older churches believed that.

Of course you realize that the local Church in the early centuries is often not a very impressive affair. Celsus describes a typical group of the Christians whom he despises:

> 'Workers in wool, and leather, laundrymen, and persons of the most uneducated and rustic character, who would not venture to utter a word in the presence of their elders or of their wiser masters. . . .' [4]

But, he adds, what a gabbling goes on when they are alone, or when they get hold of some one as uninstructed as themselves! I have seen just such. You may see them in any group of reclaimed outcastes or of low-caste Christians in South India.

[1] General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1796.

[2] Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, iii. 52.

[3] *Ib.*, 457.

[4] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iii. 55.

Leatherworkers and dhobies are despised there too. Just like those slaves of the Roman Empire, these offscourings of Indian society steal away to the meeting of that new community where their serfdom is forgotten. There these base ones take on a new dignity. Celsus' wool-worker is perhaps a catechist; the tanner a reader of the Scriptures; the voice which has echoed through the laundry may lead in the singing of the hymns. They enter a different world, where they are no more slaves of the household of Junius or Andronicus—or, shall we say chattels of the landlord of Travancore or Hyderabad—but sons and daughters of the household of God. 'Called Christians by the vulgar,' says Tacitus. It sounds very much like what a Chinese intellectual would say if he followed you in to see the rather ill-ordered worship of a Chinese congregation; shopmen and coolies, working women, and old grannies so nearly illiterate that they have to follow the reading of the prayerbook with a finger on each character, and even so they are half a sentence behind. 'I find nothing in it,' says Pliny, the enlightened governor of Bithynia, writing to the Emperor Trajan, 'nothing but a debased superstition carried to great extremes.' He had been questioning under torture 'two women who were called deaconesses.' They were not the stuff to impress him much. Biblewomen, we should call them now.

Yet their numbers increased. At the end of the second century Tertullian is able to claim:

> 'We are of yesterday, yet we have filled everything of yours—cities, tenements, villages, towns, markets, even camps, tribes, town-councils, palace, senate, forum; we have left to you only the temples.' [1]

After careful weighing of the evidence, Harnack agrees that the period after Commodus (d. 192) 'saw Christianity a serious factor in the provinces and throughout the Empire.' [2] He finds it still more amazing that so early as this same period the non-Christian world should recognize Christians as 'the third race': 'Plane, tertium genus dicimur.' [3] Roman polytheists, Jews, and Christians, that is the order.

At about the same stage in its progress, according to the measure of time, men of the 'Early Church' to-day might make their boast as boldly as Tertullian. For ten years we have seen the number of the Church's adherents (not counting the Roman communion) in lands of the Younger Churches advance by half a million a year.[4] The third race? In India parliamentary representation has been introduced on a communal basis, and that has meant recognition of Christianity as, next to Hinduism and Islam, the third community—a sign of success not without its embarrassments because of the political implications. As for Christianity's being 'a serious factor in the provinces,' in China so long ago as 1912 one could turn from the undistinguished congregation mentioned above, and remember that in Kwangtung 65 per cent of the provincial officials were the product of Christian schools, and that in Peking three cabinet ministers were professing Christians.

Indeed one's thoughts may with justice leave the age of Tertullian and go on to the Christian Empire. In the middle of the seventeenth century at the downfall of the Ming dynasty, Jesuit priests baptized the son of the fugitive Emperor, and gave him the name of Constantine. They hoped that the throne might be regained and he become the first Christian Emperor of Rome's Eastern counterpart. That was not to be. But a triumph not dissimilar to that of the fourth century, except indeed in the depth of the experience of conversion, is to be seen in the Generalissimo and his lady, and their open patronage of the Christian cause to-day.

How did the faith spread? Celsus gives us a picture of that too. 'They get hold of young people and certain women as ignorant as themselves. They pour out wonderful statements.' The gist of them is: Take no notice of your father or your teachers. We alone know the right way to live. We will show you how to be happy and to make your home happy. The conversation is interrupted by the approach of some one of real authority, so they give a parting invitation, '"Come with the women and your playmates to the woman's apartments, or the leather shop, or the laundry. There you may attain to the perfect life!" With such words they win them over.' [5]

He means it to be a sinister picture of ignorant busybodies disturbing the peace of a household. But some of us as we read think with affection of similar humble witnesses whom we know. Let those barely literate women of an Eastern congregation to-day get an opening into any home, and they will be there, regularly and in turn, to read the Scriptures in the women's apartments. If the

[1] *Apology*, xxxvii.

[2] *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, i. 32.

[3] Tertullian, *Ad Nationes*, i. 8; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 275.

[4] *Interpretative Statistical Survey of the World Mission*, 18.

[5] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iii. 55.

Church gets one of a family its members do not let go until the family is Christian. I know a barber's shop in a Chinese city where during a haircut the assistant told me, 'We too have an opportunity to hear the gospel. The proprietor is a Christian.' I know a restaurant where the master led nineteen of his young waiters to Christian baptism on one day. I know a hotel where the Christian management makes a point of having a Bible in every bedroom. Above all, I think of one Chinese friend who told me, 'There is always somebody I'm after!' It is still true that by such devices they win them over.

Of course there was opposition—was, and is. More men have suffered martyrdom for the Lord Jesus during these last twenty-five years than in all the heroic centuries to which we look back as to the Church's golden age. The same spirit which has been the glory of Western Christendom has reappeared, true to type, in every land wheresoever the Church has been planted. The only considerable national delegation absent from the Madras Meeting was that of Manchuria. They could not get passports. Indeed many Christians leaders had lost their liberty. Not a few have laid down their lives. That is one example.

I sat next to an ordinary-looking young man during one session at Madras. He shocked me by prefacing some statement with the words, 'A few weeks ago when I came out of prison . . .' I glanced at his name-card, turned him up in my *Who's Who*—a young Turk from Chinese Turkestan. The eastward spread of the power of the Soviets has added this to the tale of territories where Christians are driven out, or driven into the catacombs. That is the second type of modern persecution.

I can tell little of first-hand experience among the confessors and holy martyrs of these days, but I do know something of the apologists. I was working among students in China during the Anti-Christian Movement of 1925–8. Here extremes of Nationalism and Communism combined.[1]

> 'We especially oppose Christianity because of:
> Science: evolution, astronomy, psychology, and physiology destroy belief in creation and immortality.
> Morals: the doctrine of redemption encourages sin. . . .
> Nationalism: Christianity is the vanguard of imperialism and a means of exploitation.'

They were even clever enough to pick up bits of imported Biblical criticism and hurl our own problems at us for our greater confusion. It seemed to young Christians a dreadfully formidable attack, so new and unexpected to those who had regarded themselves, and been regarded, as pioneers of progress, morality, and patriotism. I was able to turn up charges made by second-century anti-Christian writers.[2] Christianity was unscientific—'Certain of them do not wish either to give or receive reasons for those things which they hold—They say, Do not examine, only believe!' Christianity was immoral—'Whoever, they say, is a sinner . . . him will the Kingdom of God receive. . . . Whom else would a man invite if he were making proclamation for a band of robbers?' Christianity denationalized—'They have forsaken their national rites for the Law of Christ.' Yes, even Biblical criticism—'Is it Moses who lied, or Jesus? Did the Father . . . forget . . . or did He change His mind, and condemning His own laws send forth a messenger with the opposite instructions?' There it is, the whole lot of it, not something formidable and new, but a failure eighteen centuries old! And in that spirit we began to face our critics with confidence, and with a smile.

Besides opposition from one or other of modern extremist ideologies, there is opposition from the religions which Christianity seeks to dispossess. When from Jerusalem in 1928 men looked out upon the non-Christian religions of the world, they saw old spiritual homes breaking up, unable to stand against the pressure of modern life. Increasingly it was becoming a question of either the Christian religion or no religion. 'Madras, 1938' came to different findings. We saw old religions taking on new strength. Often this is by alliance with national, racial, or *volk* feeling. Such is the case with Hinayana Buddhism in Ceylon, Burma, and Thailand; with Hinduism; and with the young Muslim who thus forcibly expressed himself, 'I don't give a damn for the Koran, but I'd die for the Muslim community.'

Another factor is that many non-Christian religions have been leavened by Christian influences, and have come consciously to copy Christian ways. They sing 'How sweet the name of Buddha sounds,' start a Y.M.B.A., a hospital of the red swastika, a Buddhist evangelistic campaign, tracts, magazines, and wireless broadcasts. Hindus preach Christian ideals, but read them back into their own *Vedas*, to show that India has no need of Christ. Even changeless Islam has had to translate its Arabic

[1] See my *Chinese Realities*, 134–159, for further translations of their propaganda.

[2] The quotations which follow are all extracts from *Contra Celsum*.

Scriptures into the languages of the people in order to compete with the Bible Societies.

But it has all happened before. Julian the Apostate[1] (361–3) called to the peoples of the Roman Empire to 'worship the gods rightly and justly in the manner transmitted to us from the most ancient times.' Paganism was extolled as worship of 'gods of your forefathers,' Christianity dismissed as 'servitude to the despisers of your national rites.'

Still more striking a parallel is Julian's attempt to revitalize paganism. Attention must be paid, he says, to the means whereby 'irreligion' (*i.e.* Christianity) has spread—'humanity to strangers, care in burying the dead, pretended sanctity of life.' Priests must begin to attend temple worship with their wives and children and servants, stop going to licentious shows, break their associations with charioteers and dancers. They must not truckle to dignitaries, but treat a nobleman as a private individual once he enters the temple. Julian may call it '*pretended* sanctity,' but here is sound testimony to family life, morality, and spiritual independence among the Christian clergy!

> 'Erect hospitals in every city,' he says, 'that strangers may partake of our benevolence; and not only those of our own religion, but others also.'

This is explained with surprising candour:

> 'None of the Jews beg, and the impious Galileans relieve both their own poor and ours.'

But these virtues he, too, seeks to read back into his Homer:

> 'Accustom them to acts of kindness, and teach them that this was the old way.'

Thus he adopted for paganism, says Gregory of Nazianzus,[2] schools, preaching, lectures both moral and doctrinal, a liturgy, the penitential system, the catechumenate and baptism, hostels for pilgrims, monasteries, charity, letters of introduction for travellers, 'things which he had especially admired in our institutions.'

Paganism has vanished in the West—at least until its recent German revival. The only lasting significance of Julian's attempt to re-establish it, is that he thus provides, in a century when there are many evidences of the spread of a merely nominal Christianity, the best testimony to the Church's widespread influence, incomparable standards, and capacity to endure.

With regard to the revival of paganism in modern Europe, one may be forgiven recalling the story of a scoffer of Julian's time: 'What,' said he, 'is your Carpenter doing now?' Said the unperturbed Christian, 'Making a coffin for your Emperor!' We may well be thankful that we belong to the *historic* Church, especially if for us through our fellowship with the Younger Churches, Church History has come to life.[3]

[1] Good examples of the writings of Julian may be found in B. J. Kidd, *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church*, ii. 50–66; also in the lengthy article in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

[2] *Orationes*, iv. 111.

[3] Other subjects suggest themselves for comparison: I hope in next month's article to deal with second-century Gnosticism and attempts at 'indigenous expression' now. The great subject of Church and State in the third century and now—including the re-appearance of Emperor worship in the Japanese Empire—demands separate treatment on some future occasion.

Literature.

ENGLISH EVANGELICALISM.

Simeon and Church Order (Cambridge University Press; 16s. net), by Canon Charles Smyth, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, is composed of the Birkbeck Lectures for 1937–38. It is a study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival at Cambridge in the eighteenth century. Charles Simeon is the outstanding personality of the movement. He represents the Anglican type of Evangelicalism in the Church of England. In the period covered by these lectures John Berridge appears to have been the leading representative of the un-Anglican type. The author of this volume makes no concealment of his conviction that the Anglican type is the one to be approved.

First come four lectures that form a sketch of the historic background of Simeon's ministry in the Church of England. The first three deal with the problems by which Simeon first found himself confronted during his ministry: namely, the problems of the Home, the School, the University.

The fourth, entitled 'Berridge of Everton,' completes the sketch of the historic background and illustrates the problem of Church Order. The fifth lecture illustrates, under the title of 'Cadogan of Reading,' the problem of Continuity, which along with the other problems aforementioned, confronted not Simeon alone but the whole evangelical party within the Church of England. The sixth lecture returns to the problem of Church Order and to John Berridge.

In Canon Smyth's judgment the problems of Continuity and Church Order were the two most crucial problems that the Evangelical Party had to face, and he regards Simeon's solution as 'decisive' in each case, serving to retain that Party in the Church of England. It was by the purchase of livings that Simeon secured continuity of teaching in the parishes. And by his exclusive attitude towards the Dissenters he counteracted that 'pastoral enthusiasm' (such as we meet with in his contemporary Rowland Hill) which traversed the principle of order.

But Simeon was himself guilty of certain irregularities; and Canon Smyth appears to think that the grossest and most regrettable of them were committed on his Scottish tour, when he preached in Presbyterian churches. It is all in vain that Simeon defends his practice as in accordance with Church Order: he preached as a member of an Established Church from an Established Church pulpit. Canon Smyth will have none of this. He is a stickler for the proprieties. One may sympathize with his rigorism, but it is difficult to respect the complacency and condescension of his attitude towards the Church of Scotland. It is a travesty to suggest that 'its ancient arrogance' has largely given place to 'a nervous sense of inferiority,' shown in eagerness to entice Anglican dignitaries into its pulpits ('and thereby to score off the Episcopalians'); or that in the religious observance of Christmas and Good Friday it is 'furtively copying the despised and disestablished Scottish Church.' Nor is it by such language that the larger communion in Christendom will be furthered for which he hopefully looks.

But we have nothing but admiration for the way in which Canon Smyth has fulfilled the general task to which he set his hand. We agree that in a field of research where most of 'the really important stuff' is printed, you can be an historian without yielding to 'the tyranny of archives.' And it is a vast field which he has investigated, and he has presented the results in an engaging form and in a style at once genial and pungent.

We hesitate to revert to the point; but it is another indication of his being out of real and intimate touch with Scottish sentiment and practice, when he speaks of 'scraping' at sermons, in registration of disapproval, as surviving in the Universities of 'North Britain.'

W. Fulton.

A CHRONOLOGICAL OUTLOOK.

The subject of this work—*The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus*, by the Rev. George Ogg, B.D., B.Sc., D.Litt. (Cambridge University Press; 15s. net)—is one notoriously of excessive difficulty, and Dr. Ogg must be heartily congratulated on having produced a work which will have to be taken account of by all who are interested in the subject. Not only has he given the most minute study to the ancient texts that have a bearing on this question, but he has read widely in the writings of modern scholars of various countries and tendencies. His power of sane and acute judgment is no less evident than his multifarious learning. Among the ancient commentators Peter of Laodicea (ed. Heinrici, 1908), who was deeply indebted to Origen, was perhaps worth consultation, and among the moderns Sir W. M. Ramsay's article in the *Expositor* for 1908, 'The Morning Star and the Chronology of the Life of Christ,' but these are all the omissions we have noticed.

The book is divided into four parts, 'The Duration of the Ministry', 'When did the Ministry begin?', 'When did the Ministry End?', and 'Towards a Chronological Outline.' The first part is divided into six chapters, covering the Gospels and post-canonical times. In these are included an introduction and a 'review.' The second part contains a discussion of the forty-six years of Jn 2^{20} and the chronological notice of Lk 3^{1-2}. In part three the date of the Crucifixion in the Jewish Calendar and the year of the Crucifixion are considered. The fourth part is sufficiently described in its title. It is impossible to follow the close-knit reasoning of the book in detail. We must be content to mention some of the conclusions at which the author has arrived.

The view that the Crucifixion took place in A.D. 29 is rejected. The one-year ministry is considered to refer only to Galilee, and a three-year ministry is upheld. Dr. Eisler is honoured by a special note on his views of Gospel chronology. Dr. Ogg decides for A.D. 33 as the date of the Crucifixion. He will rightly have nothing to do with the suggested

transposition of chapters 5 and 6 in the text of the Fourth Gospel.

Not only is this a great book in itself, but it will constitute an admirable introduction for the young student into what research really means.

A. Souter.

TRANSJORDAN.

This country, which has an area of forty thousand square kilometres, is bounded on the north by the French mandated territory of Syria, on the east by Iraq and Nejd, on the south by the Hejaz, and on the west by the Jordan. What it was like in Old Testament times, especially in the early years of the Jewish monarchy, is described in *The Other Side of the Jordan*, by Nelson Glueck, Professor in the Hebrew Union College, Cincinatti, and Director of the American School in Jerusalem (American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven, Conn.; $2.50). The volume presents us, in language that is non-technical and yet scientifically exact, with the important results of the author's archæological activities in this part of the Near East. After an excellent statement of what Biblical Archæology is, it gives an interesting and readable account of the Desert of Eastern Transjordan, King Solomon's copper mines, his seaport of Ezion-Geber, the archæological characteristics of Edom, Moab, Ammon, and Gilead, and the civilization of the Nabataeans. It is beautifully printed, well indexed (thanks to Professor Clarence S. Fisher), and embellished with over a hundred photographic figures. Historians and Biblical students have long regarded Transjordan as consisting of permanent desert lands, with a lack of rainfall and with a sparse population, but Professor Glueck shows, as a result of pottery finds on hundreds of sites in the abandoned areas, that there were extensive settlements there in Old Testament times. Many well-known scholars, however, will not agree with him that there was no permanent sedentary occupation of Edom and Moab between the nineteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. (a view based merely on the surface pottery found at the present day), and that consequently the Exodus of the Israelites could not have taken place till after the latter date, seeing that the Biblical account of their march (Nu 20) speaks of an Edomite 'king' and his refusal to allow them to pass through his land. This argument has already been sufficiently answered by other archæologists of repute (see also Expository Times, June, 1937, p. 409). Nor is it quite correct to say (p. 114) that 'the accounts of episodes in or about the age of Abraham,' such as those in Gn 14 (which the author includes), were handed down 'somehow or other by word of mouth from father to son,' for many particulars in Gn 14, as well as in other parts of Genesis, have undoubtedly been based on cuneiform records. The volume, however, from a competent excavator, is a valuable addition to our knowledge of Transjordan in ancient times, and it deserves a prominent place in the library of every Biblical student.

J. W. Jack.

THE LACHISH TEMPLE.

Biblical students who are interested in the remarkable discoveries made at Lachish (*Tell ed-Duweir*, twenty-five miles south-west of Jerusalem) will welcome *Lachish II., The Fosse Temple*, by Olga Tufnell, Charles H. Inge, and Lankester Harding (Milford; 25s. net). The book is dedicated to the memory of Mr. J. L. Starkey, whose five years' brilliant work as Director of the Wellcome-Marston Expedition came to such a tragic end in January, 1938. It has been prepared by other hands, trusted and competent certainly, but the inspiration and the results described are almost entirely his. It is probable that there was an important place of worship within the city of Lachish, but the volume describes the excavations made at the small subsidiary one of three or four rooms, which stood in the defensive fosse outside the city wall and mound. Here worship was evidently tolerated by the authorities and seems to have attracted an increasing number of devotees, probably of the poorer class, during its two and a half centuries of existence (*c.* 1475–1230 B.C.). The building, which had been twice renovated or rebuilt, owing to the increasing prosperity of the city, was ultimately burned to the ground and completely destroyed, probably by the Pharaoh Merenptah, who is known to have invaded southern Palestine in 1230 B.C. and ravaged many cities. The destruction seems to have been so sudden that the offerings and vessels of worship have been found still in position, overspread with a thick layer of ash. The volume gives a comprehensive account of the discovery of the temple, the nature of the buildings, the inscriptions, the pottery (no less than 2165 pots have been examined), and other interesting matters, and it contains over eighty beautiful plates, including four in full colour, as well as numerous plans. The details contained in the volume are of special interest to archæologists; and, as they throw light on the

lives of the Canaanites and Hebrews, they will appeal particularly to Old Testament students. In addition to an excellent Index, there are several Appendices, one of which gives a list of Bible references, while another discusses the question of the animal bones found round the altar and in the bin outside. The authors are to be congratulated on such an interesting and trustworthy publication.

J. W. Jack.

A SCHOLARLY PREACHER.

The latest addition to 'The Scholar as Preacher' series is *The Strong Name*, by the Rev. James S. Stewart, B.D. (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net), and it is one of the best. Here are sound scholarship and real preaching joined in such a superlative combination as is rarely met with.

When the critical scholarship of the nineteenth century was brought to bear upon the Gospel records, where it did not destroy faith it certainly dulled the passion of preaching. Cool balanced judgment and restrained statement were all in favour, and the gospel was too often presented in a 'take it or leave it' manner as an interesting subject of scientific study rather than a way of eternal life. In the desperate days in which we now live, with the nations floundering ever deeper in the abyss, such calm dissertations are futile and something more urgent and passionate is called for.

This is the note of Mr. Stewart's preaching. He has seen the overthrow of the pre-war optimistic humanism, he has passed through the pessimistic gloom of the post-war period, and because his feet were early and firmly planted upon the old evangelical faith he has come through these times of upheaval unshaken, and with a deeper conviction of the adequacy of the Christian faith to human need.

He does not, however, 'preach up the times.' References to contemporary events are conspicuous by their absence, and only in the most general way is the background of modern life painted in. The preacher's whole concern is with the foundations of the faith and the unchanging facts of life and death and salvation. He has a profound impression of the seriousness of life, of the tragedy of sin, and of the glory of redemption. If one might venture a criticism here it is that his bow is always bent, and one feels that there should at times be a little more relaxing of the tension, with some recognition that natural human life has its green pastures and still waters. But no doubt in these days the world stands much in need of the Puritan preacher and the warrior saint.

Mr. Stewart's book contains twenty-four sermons, not a haphazard collection, as such volumes often are, but a carefully planned and orderly sequence. The title is, of course, derived from St. Patrick's well-known words, 'I bind unto myself to-day the strong name of the Trinity,' and it may be taken as a token that the preacher preaches the orthodox faith in its fullness. The sermons are arranged under three main headings—The Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, The Love of God, The Communion of the Holy Spirit. The first contains nine sermons which give a persuasive presentation of the Person and work of Jesus. The second deals mainly with the reconciliation of the love of God with the pain and suffering of the world. The last section is concerned with Christian experience and includes some beautiful Communion addresses. The whole forms a fine body of sound doctrinal teaching, lit up with imagination and dramatic power. The preacher is widely read, and he evidently reads, as Alexander Whyte recommended, with his notebook at his hand. He unites the fervour of youth with the ripening experience of middle life. As he muses the fire burns and then in the pulpit he 'stands as if he pleaded with men.'

J. H. Morrison.

THE BETRAYAL OF CHRIST.

Mr. Middleton Murry's latest book, *The Betrayal of Christ by the Churches* (Dakers; 5s. net), is a shrill blast. He is a Pacifist and naturally inclined to look critically upon his country in its desperate war effort. He is a Socialist, and the Church that will not declare itself for Socialism is a traitor to the gospel. The main line of his argument is that for the sins of Germany Britain is to blame, and for the sin of the world the Church is to blame. His interests are mainly political, and he judges the Church by the influence it has had on public policy. He is very severe on Lord Halifax for pointing out to the students of Oxford that the youth of Germany are animated by an ideal totally opposed to theirs. For this, Mr. Murry argues, Britain, and Lord Halifax in particular, are to blame. Did Britain provoke the war of 1914 or did Lord Halifax originate the teaching of Nietzsche? Did they incite the Germans to the perversion of science, the persecution of Christianity, and the tortures of the labour camps? Mr. Murry denounces the Bishop of Ely for counselling his clergy to refrain from publicly expressing opinions on matters in regard to which their information was partial. Surely a wise counsel!

One remembers Sir Alfred Zimmern's admirable

little book, 'Spiritual Values and World Affairs,' in which, with courtesy and persuasiveness, he points out occasions, giving chapter and verse, when the intervention of the Church, animated by purely Christian motives, proved mistaken and hurtful through lack of true knowledge of the situation.

Mr. Murry's criticisms are too indiscriminate to be impressive, and of constructive suggestion he has none. He conceives the Church as an authoritarian institution which should talk big among the nations and teach statesmen their business. Had he lived among the Jews of the first century he would have been of those who were disappointed in Jesus because He gave them no political lead against Roman militarism. He takes no account of the fact that there are multitudes of Christians upon whose hearts the sin of the world lies heavy, and hundreds of churches where ministers and people together, without making their voices heard on high, are daily striving 'to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with their God.'

J. H. Morrison.

THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF RELIGION.

The latest volume of the London Theological Library is *The Social Function of Religion,* by Professor E. O. James, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.S.A., D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). Dr. James is well qualified to deal with this subject. He is Professor of the History and Philosophy of Religion in the University of Leeds, and Wilde Lecturer in Natural and Comparative Religion in the University of Oxford. This specialism explains the standpoint from which the subject is viewed, and the method of treatment. The book is described as 'A Comparative Study.' While an attempt is made to interpret the integrative function of religion in terms of the eternal verities which are enshrined in Christianity, the subject is dealt with historically. Under each heading we have a review of what has been done and thought in the past, and then an estimate of the objective value of the truth under examination. These topics are such as the following: Providence, Myth and Revelation, Ritual and Worship, Ethics and Conduct, Marriage and the Family, the Church and the Community, the Nation and Nationalism, concluding with a very illuminating discussion of Religion and the Modern World. Needless to say, the scholarship is everywhere sound and sufficient, but the treatment *per se* is equally good. Dr. James succeeds in clearly demonstrating that religion, while objectively worthy and true, is at the same time the one integrative force which can hold family, State, and community together and secure their health and endurance.

Among the most valuable pages in this able book are those at the end, in which Dr. James urges the importance, in view of his main contentions, of religious education. He rightly deplores the whole system of secular education, and suggests that both in school and university a better and saner policy should give the religious element a recognized and prominent place.

F. J. Rae.

A quite charming biography of St. Vincent de Paul, under the title *Apostle of Charity,* has been written by Mr. Theodore Maynard (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). The author has used his authorities to some purpose, and he has added a style which, while plain and simple, is attractive because it is the gift of a cultured and sometimes whimsical mind. Certainly he has a perfectly absorbing subject. The story of this peasant priest (the 'de' in his name is deceptive) who dominated a court and swayed, and used, the rich in the interests of the poor, is one of the most romantic in the history of the Church. For sheer interest the book would be hard to excel. Part of the charm of Vincent was that he was so human and so sensible. But nothing can account for his influence and achievements but one thing—he was a personality, and force flowed from him and did things. Protestants as well as Romanists will learn much from this remarkable man, in particular two things—the power of team-work and the effectiveness in preaching of plain, simple language.

Nazis and Germans, by Mr. Harold Picton (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), is 'a record of personal experience' which deserves to be widely read and deeply pondered. The writer was accused during the last war of being pro-German, unjustly as he maintains, for his only offence was that he had good friends in Germany whom he refused to disown and hate. After the war he made his home in Germany until the advent to power of Hitler made life in that country unbearable. He contends that a distinction should be made between the dominant Nazis and the people over whom they tyrannize. It is easy for us to say the Germans should throw off the yoke, but the merciless tortures inflicted in the concentration camps—and some of the records here given are positively sickening—present such a frightful alternative that only the

most heroic spirits dare to resist. 'We hate the Nazi leaders as few can who have not suffered under them and seen friends suffer. But we do not hate the German people. . . . Our cause is so overwhelmingly good that there is no need to mar it by self-righteousness, nor by the irrationality of indicting a whole people.'

Barth can have few more loyal adherents than the Rev. Andrew Glendinning, M.A., Minister of the Parish of Broughton, who has written a book of popular theology, and called it *The Faith of God* (Allenson ; 5s. net). It is easy reading, and it is welcome as an uncompromising statement of the Barthian dialectic. It would, however, be more acceptable if some sensible friend of the author had pruned it of its many gross exaggerations. 'The West is barren of moral and spiritual leadership. In Europe and America there is not a man who can preach.' The outlook of the Church 'has been produced by purely naturalistic evidence winnowed by men of science in the legitimate pursuit of their calling.' Sentences like these seriously detract from the impression which a book like this should make on the mind.

In spite of that it is a good book, with an earnest purpose, and sounds a clear note of orthodoxy which is anything but traditional. Mr. Glendinning surveys the religious situation, and considers the various gospels that profess to heal its wounds—divine immanence, evolution, psychology, social reform ; and, needless to say, their hollowness is mercilessly exposed. It would be profitless to enter into an argument on the author's point of view. It may be enough to say that he states it, critically and constructively, with real ability and plain, if sometimes over-forceful, language. All through one feels the presence of a thought which he plans at the beginning of his book : 'There is something astounding in the Christian Religion.' Any one who feels with Pascal on this line has the root of the matter in him.

Fewer volumes of sermons have been published during the last month. If the number has been smaller it seems to us that the quality has been higher. This month we have three outstanding volumes, all by ministers of the Church of Scotland. The first is the Rev. James S. Stewart's *The Strong Name* (reviewed elsewhere) ; the other two are *Captain of the Storm*, by the Rev. Arthur A. Cowan, M.A. (6s. net), and *Christian Intimacies*, by the Rev. George J. Jeffrey (5s. net). The publishers of the last two volumes are Messrs. James Clarke & Co. If only one of these two volumes can be bought, we are in some difficulty in helping readers to make their choice. Both collections are based on solid scholarship and both deal with the problems and difficulties of the day seen against the background of Christian faith and practice. Mr. Jeffrey's sermons are perhaps the easier to read of the two. They are shorter for one thing and they are lightened by illustrations from life and literature. But hear what Professor A. J. Gossip says of Mr. Cowan's volume : 'There is here a real touch of style, the ability to flash out a phrase, combined with a real insight into the working of men's minds and hearts.' Perhaps the best way to make the choice is to turn to 'The Christian Year' this month for in it there will be found in shortened form a sermon from each of these two new volumes.

From New Zealand comes a very interesting and readable book—*A Saviour in Sight*, by the Rev. Leonard C. Horwood (Epworth Press ; 4s. net). It deals in a convincing way with the difficulties which for the modern man appear to block the way to faith in God and Christ. The writer faces them squarely, and while acknowledging that much remains painful and mysterious he has many wise and true things to say that are fitted to relieve doubt and encourage faith. This is a book which should give real spiritual help to many.

The bare uplands where Aberdeenshire touches Banffshire, where the winds are cool in summer and snell in winter time, has bred a race keen in mind and warm of heart. Some of its sons have won to fame, but many others, equally faithful, have tilled the soil and kept the faith in obscurity. *Beacons of Independency*, by the Rev. Harry Escott, M.A. (Express Office, Huntly ; 1s. net), tells the story of how some of them, by their devotion and sacrifice, built and maintained a number of 'missioner kirks' and helped to keep alive the flame of evangelical religion. It is a story worth telling, and it is well told.

A brilliant young football player, who was looking forward eagerly to a career as a professional, was converted, and dedicated himself (as he had been previously dedicated by his mother) to a life of evangelism. After a good deal of experience of this work at home, he was led to pursue the same task abroad, and set out with his wife, accompanied by Miss (or Mrs. ?) Eva Stuart Watt as a kind of Boswell. They travelled through Czecho-Slovakia, Moravia, Hungary, Poland, Ruthenia, Rumania, and Serbia, preaching the Word, and the record of

their adventure, difficulties, and triumphs is contained in the lady's book—*Dynamite in Europe* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net). The author wields a practised pen, and the narrative is a travel document of great interest at the present time, as well as a story of the gospel and its power.

Future History in 'The Revelation,' by Mr. R. H. Clayton, M.A. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), is a fresh study of the Apocalypse, in which the author adopts (but not slavishly) the futurist interpretation of the book. He thinks that the key to its meaning and message is to be found in its structure, and he has made an elaborate investigation into this subject. Mr. Clayton is an Australian, and his writings on history and social subjects are well known in his own country. He has also the reputation of being an accomplished scholar, so that his book will receive respectful study from those (and they are many) who are specially interested in apocalyptic writings. Many scholars have tackled the problem of this book. Mr. Clayton has entered into their labours, but his theory is his own, and its freshness and originality is one of its main features.

Famous English Sermons, 730–1939, edited by Mr. Ashley Sampson (Nelson; 5s. net), contains a selection of sermons beginning with one by the Venerable Bede and concluding with a Lenten sermon by Mr. C. S. Lewis preached before the University of Oxford in 1939. It is difficult to criticise such a selection as it simply represents the taste and preference of the editor. One might be disposed to question the adjective 'famous' in the title for the particular sermons selected have no outstanding place in history. Of the thirteen post-Reformation sermons no fewer than eight are Anglican. Of the other five, one each is assigned to a Presbyterian, a Methodist, a Roman Catholic, a Baptist, and a Congregational preacher. Taken together, they form a valuable collection, giving samples of English preaching down through the ages. It is encouraging to note that the latest sermon for strength of Christian thinking and lucidity of expression can stand comparison with the best of older times.

The History of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, 1840–1940, by Professor J. R. Elder, C.M.G., M.A., D.Litt. (Presbyterian Bookroom, Christchurch; 22s. 6d. net), is written in connexion with the centenary of the New Zealand Church, but it reaches a standard far higher than such commemorative volumes usually attain to. It is not a mere laudatory compilation. It is a genuine history, comprehensive, well planned, and eminently readable. There is necessarily a great mass of detail, but the wood is never lost sight of among the trees. The political and social background of the Church's work is skilfully painted in, so that the reader gets an interesting picture of New Zealand life. The pages are lit up by thirty to forty illustrations of very fine quality, and an appendix gives a complete register of all the ministers who have laboured in the Church from its inception. It is a centenary volume of which the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand has good reason to be proud and which it will doubtless cherish.

The problems that gather round the question of a future life press upon us urgently in a time of war, and the Rev. F. Townley Lord, D.D., faces them all in his book, *Conquest of Death,* which he describes as 'A Christian Interpretation of Immortality' (S.C.M.; 6s. net). Is any proof possible? What are our grounds, general and Christian, for our belief? What is the nature of the future life? Does the sinner get a second chance? Is punishment eternal? Shall we recognize our loved ones? Is prayer for the dead Christian? These are questions we want to have answered, especially the *kind* of life that awaits us, and the pressing problem of recognition. Dr. Lord has in view, first of all, those who are believers, and, secondly, the 'man in the street' who is anxious to listen to any one who has anything to say. For both, we can confidently recommend this book as a sound, frank, and intelligent guide amid their perplexities. It would be difficult to find a better.

For over half a century Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer has laboured by voice and pen for the Kingdom of God. He has now published, under the title of *The Art of Listening to God* (Zondervan, Grand Rapids; $1.50), a number of papers which he describes as 'Studies in some neglected Values of Life, Religion, and Missions.' These papers deal with a variety of topics though they have a unity of purpose. Of special interest are the papers on Mahatma Gandhi's Religion, Mohammed and Calvin, and on Moslem Missions. On the subject of Islam Dr. Zwemer is an authority, but whatever be the topic he touches upon he writes with clearness, sound sense, and ripe Christian wisdom. One of his chapters is entitled 'Life Begins at Seventy,' and this book may be taken as a confirmation of that bold thesis.

The Place of Theology among the Sciences.

By Professor J. M. Shaw, D.D., Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Ontario.

Theology once bore the proud title of 'the Queen of the Sciences.' It is to be feared that in recent years for a variety of reasons it no longer holds this high position, either in popular estimation or in the judgment of many scientists. The purpose of this article is to endeavour to re-establish theology in its ancient dignity, and to justify for it still the ancient and honourable appellation of 'the science of sciences,' *scientia scientiarum*.

I.

Theology, it must be acknowledged, has often been presented in a somewhat dismal and dogmatic way, as the record of old outworn controversies about creed and doctrine which seem now to have little relation to everyday life and interest. Like the fallen angels, in Milton's representation of their existence in the nether darkness, theologians have often

> reasoned high
> Of Providence, Foreknowledge, Will, and Fate—
> Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute—
> And found no end, in wandering mazes lost.

This, however, has been the weakness of theologians rather than their strength, or, perhaps we should say, the weakness allied to their strength. For the deeper and higher the realm of facts which we attempt to know, the easier it is to get into the region of mystery and to find ourselves 'in wandering mazes lost.' All knowledge, indeed, knowledge of any realm or aspect of things, in the measure in which it attempts to become complete or thorough, leads into mystery, inasmuch as in a universe which is a system or organic connected whole, a complete knowledge of any part would require a knowledge of the whole. As Tennyson expressed this truth in his little poem on the 'flower in the crannied wall':

> Flower in the crannied wall,
> I pluck you out of the crannies,
> I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
> Little flower—but *if* I could understand
> What you are, root and all, and all in all,
> I should know what God and man is.

1. By way of attaining a more adequate idea of the nature and function of theology, let us begin by taking the guidance of the word itself. 'Theology' means literally 'the doctrine of God,' or 'the teaching about God,' or just as 'geology' is defined as the science of the constitution and structure of the earth, or 'biology' as the science of life and living organisms; so, in like manner, 'theology' may be defined as the science of God and of things spiritual—that department of science or scientific knowledge which deals with the realm of the religious, the knowledge of God and of spiritual things generally.

Some scientists, indeed, would immediately look askance at such a definition of theology, and raise objection to it on the ground that the term 'science' or 'scientific knowledge' should properly be confined to the realm of what is ordinarily called natural scientific knowledge, knowledge attainable by the methods proper to the realm of what we call 'the natural sciences.' This is, in effect, the objection which the poet Tennyson, under the influence of the mid-Victorian scientific way of thinking of his time—a way of thinking which, on the acknowledgment of scientists themselves, is now largely obsolete—gave expression to in these terms:

> We have but faith: we cannot know;
> For knowledge is of things we see.

In matters of religion and religious truth, he meant, we can only have faith, not knowledge proper. This, however, is an unwarranted and unjustifiable limitation of the term 'knowledge,' which would thus confine or restrict it to the knowledge of Nature and the world about us, the knowledge of 'things we see.' There is a knowledge, and a properly scientific knowledge, possible also of things we do not see. These material forces, indeed, of which the natural scientist, the physicist for example or the chemist, speaks so much, what are they? The more they are being investigated to-day by what is called the 'new physics' the more they are being resolved into something spiritual. At first blush, it is true, matter appears the most solidly real thing in the world, as Dr. Samuel Johnson apparently thought when to refute a more idealistic way of thinking, he violently kicked his foot against a stone. But, in the hands of the new physicists, solid matter and the solid atoms of which matter was supposed to be composed have disappeared. The atom has been resolved into a bundle of energy, into bundles or packets of

energy indeed of various sorts. So that we hear to-day not only of protons and electrons, but also of neutrons, positrons, mesotrons and what not, without the new physicist on his own acknowledgment having any clear conception of what these names signify. As Sir Arthur Eddington has frankly put it, 'Something unknown is doing we know not what.' So that he adds, 'What is the use of talking about materialism, when you don't know what material is?' And to like effect Professor A. N. Whitehead, another of these present-day scientists or scientific philosophers, asked, 'What is the sense of talking about a mechanical explanation, when you do not know what you mean by mechanics?' So that the result of the latest scientific investigations is the acknowledgment, on the part of scientists themselves, that so far from material forces being the only thing we know, and knowledge being only 'of things we see' we really do not know what this matter which we see is, and the only kind of force or energy which we really know, know at first hand, is what we call spiritual energy, the energy namely of our own wills or persons.

2. The whole universe of our knowledge, indeed, is divisible into two chief spheres or realms, the realm of the material or natural on the one hand, and the realm of the spiritual on the other. Or, as we may put it more properly and sufficiently precisely for our present purpose, the realm of 'things' or 'objects' and the realm of 'persons' or 'subjects.' For the proper knowledge, for the properly scientific in the sense of rational ordered systematized knowledge, of these two realms or spheres different conditions are required, according to the specific character of the realm or sphere of reality with which we are dealing. As Aristotle, the ancient 'master of them that know,' already observed, there are different kinds or levels of knowledge corresponding to different kinds or levels of reality or experience to be known. In the case of the knowledge of 'things' or 'objects,' the knowledge, for example, of Nature and the world about us—that knowledge which comes to its perfection in what are ordinarily, though somewhat improperly, called 'the exact sciences'—the conditions of knowledge are observation and a certain degree of the development of the intellect or reason, that degree of development which is implied in the entertaining of the conception of 'causation' or 'cause and effect,' or of 'law' and 'order' in the world. But for the knowledge of 'persons,' that knowledge which comes to its proper expression in the knowledge and appreciation which friends have of one another, more and other conditions are required than merely rational or intellectual conditions. There is needed also a certain quality of character and disposition, an attitude of trustful, sympathetic insight which is more than purely intellectual or rational. Treat a person as an object or a thing merely, after the manner of the natural scientist, as an object simply to be fitted into a rational scheme of things, and you will never know him as a person, much less as a friend. To do that, you must give him your trust, your sympathy, your appreciation. For a proper knowledge of persons, that is to say, as contrasted with a knowledge of things or objects, more and other than merely intellectual or rational conditions are needed, qualities of character and disposition as well as of reason or intellect.

3. Now what is true for the knowledge of human persons is most of all true for the knowledge of God, the supreme Divine personality with whom we are concerned in religion. In this case above all a certain attitude of the heart and disposition, of the conscience and the will, is needed as well as a certain development of the intelligence or understanding. That is to say, religious knowledge, knowledge of God and of things spiritual, is morally and spiritually conditioned in a way and to a degree in which knowledge of Nature and of things about us is not. As the Christian Apostle put it: 'the natural man (or, as we would say to-day, the merely intellectual man) receiveth not the things of the Spirit . . . neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' It is not that religious knowledge, or knowledge of spiritual things, is on this account more 'subjective,' more the product of individual preference or desire or even whim, and in this sense is less assured or certain or 'objective' than ordinary scientific knowledge. This is a way of thinking that is apt to be suggested by the emphasis sometimes put on faith or trust or 'the will to believe' in religious knowledge—an emphasis that, as traditionally expressed, has too often justified the Scottish schoolboy's naïve definition of faith as 'believing what you know ain't true.' It is a way of thinking that in the present day is encouraged specially by what is called 'the New Psychology,' more particularly in its psycho-analytic aspect; which tends to represent the belief in God and the spiritual world generally as 'a mere projection' into the world of outer objective or trans-subjective reality of our own purely subjective wishes and desires. Such a representation would involve a separation or dichotomy between religious knowledge and truth,

and such a separation would mean ultimately the death of religion. No; it is not that the truth attained by religious knowledge is less true, less objective, less objectively true or certain, than the truth attained by ordinary natural scientific knowledge. It is rather that the knowledge of its truth or certainty, of its objectivity, is attained in a different way, is determined by different conditions, from the knowledge of natural scientific truth. Once attained, however, religious knowledge, knowledge of God and of spiritual things, is as true, as objective, as any so-called natural scientific knowledge, and has to be related to it, united harmoniously with it in one coherent system of truth, truth being ultimately one because God is one.

II.

This, then, is our first main point, that there is a specific department of facts, a specific realm of reality or of experience, with which theology deals, what are called the facts of religious experience and knowledge—the experience and knowledge resulting from fellowship with God—and that this realm is as much the proper object of knowledge, of objectively valid knowledge, as any other realm of facts.

1. But we go further and say—this is our second main point—that the facts with which theology deals, the facts of religious experience and knowledge, are not only as much facts and as objectively valid facts of knowledge as any other fact, but that they are of all the facts of our experience the facts which are of most worth or value for a total interpretation of the universe. Said that acute philosopher F. H. Bradley in his work entitled *Appearance and Reality*: 'There is nothing more real than what comes in religion. To compare facts such as these with what is given to us in outward existence, would be to trifle with the subject. The man, who demands a reality more solid than that of the religious consciousness, seeks he does not know what.' And more recently G. K. Chesterton expressed this same truth in his own whimsical way when he said that the most important question for a student to put to a prospective landlady is this: 'What, madam, is your total view of the universe?' The 'total view of the universe,' the interpretation of the universe as a whole,—this is really the question with which theology most fundamentally is concerned. It puts it usually in this form, 'What is God?' What is the nature and purpose of the ultimate principle or power at the heart of things? A man's answer to this question determines ultimately his total view of the world and life. Given the arc, we can complete the circle. So given a man's view of the power at the heart of things, from that we can construct his total view of existence. More than that, it determines not only the total thought and life of the individual, it determines also ultimately the whole thought and life of societies and of nations. It was a great German philosopher of other days, the philosopher Hegel, who said in wise and pregnant words which are worth recalling at the present time: 'A nation which has a false or bad conception of God has also a bad state, bad government, and bad laws.' So vitally determinative for the thought and life both of individuals and of nations is the fundamental question with which theology deals.

2. To this fundamental question the answer of theology—at least of Christian theology, and it is this we have specially in mind in the present article, the knowledge of God which we have through His supreme revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ, His life and death and risen living working—is that the Power at the heart of the universe is most adequately thought of as a Supreme, Wise, Moral, and Loving Personality who is properly called Father, our Heavenly Father. Did the limits of this article permit, which they do not except in the briefest and most schematic form, it might be shown that such a view of the ultimate Reality or Power is vital and determinative in all relationships of thought and life, and alone enables us to make sense, not only of the facts of Christian religious experience, the experience of fellowship with God through Jesus Christ, but also of the total facts of human experience and life.

(*a*) *First*, of the facts with which science itself is concerned. The scientist is concerned with the discovery of law and order, of regularity of sequence, among the facts of experience with which his particular science deals. When he has discovered these laws he is as scientist, *qua* scientist, satisfied. But this is after all incomplete, unfinished thinking, it is what is called 'abstract' thinking, that is to say, thinking which for its own limited scientific purposes abstracts from other aspects of experience, and in particular from more ultimate questions of meaning and purpose. How explain this system of law or order, of rational connexion, which he has thus as scientist discovered in the world of his investigations? He himself, the scientist, knows he is not the author of these laws, he is only their discoverer. Who then is, or what is? To suggest as the more materialistic type of scientist—if there is any such really left—that somehow things, atoms

or electrons, or whatever we call them, have somehow just happened to fall together into harmony or order by a kind of blind mechanical propulsion, this is as reasonable or unreasonable as to say that the letters of the alphabet just happened to fall together to make a play of Shakespeare or a poem of Browning. No: the fundamental principle of all scientific thinking is what is called the Principle of Sufficient Reason, and this Principle cannot be satisfied short of positing or affirming back of the orderly, rational universe in which we find ourselves a great supreme Intelligence or Reason whom we call God.

(*b*) *Second.* Such a view of the Ultimate Reality and of the Power at the heart of things is vital and necessary also to enable us to make sense of the facts of history, the facts of the rise and fall of nations and of men. Whatever difficulties there may be about individual or isolated facts of history, yet history viewed in the large, in the long run and on the big scale, does bear witness to the fact that there is a moral order in the world and a Moral Orderer, in Matthew Arnold's words, 'a Power not ourselves making for righteousness.' Says the eminent English historian J. A. Froude on this point: 'That this world is somehow built on moral foundations is the lesson of history. In the long run it is well with the good, and ill with the wicked. This is the only teaching which history repeats with any distinctness.' And the only sufficient reason and adequate ground of explanation of this fact is that over all there is not only a Supreme Reason or Intelligence but a Supreme Moral Orderer or Governor of history.

(*c*) And *third*, such a view of God, the Ultimate Reality, as we have indicated theology, and in particular Christian theology, offers, is vital and necessary too, it may be added, from the point of view of the artist as well as from the point of view of the scientist and the historian. The world in which we find ourselves is a world of beauty as well as of law and of moral order and purpose, a beauty which meets us even in the most hidden and untracked places, and bears witness surely to a God over all who is not only intelligent and moral but kind and loving, concerned not only for His children's material needs, but also for the good of their spirits. As Bliss Carman, one of our Canadian poets, puts this thought in his little poem entitled 'Vestigia':

> I took a day to look for God
> And found Him not.
> But as I trod
> O'er rocky ledge, thro' woods untamed,
> Just where one scarlet lily flamed,
> I saw His footprints in the sod.

Such a view of God and the universe, then, as Christian theology presents us with—this is our conclusion—is not only demanded by the facts of religious experience involved in fellowship with God through Jesus Christ, but alone enables us to make sense of and do right by the total facts of human experience, scientific, moral, and æsthetic or artistic as well as properly religious. It roots the great values of life—truth, goodness, and beauty—in the very heart of reality, giving them cosmic validity or worth. Thus it is that in theology, as the scientific study of the facts of religious experience, and in particular of the facts of Christian religious experience, we are concerned with a study which is of supreme determining significance for our interpretation of reality as a whole. It is a study or discipline which is not of merely intellectual or theoretic interest, but has the utmost practical significance. For if the values or ideals of life referred to express the true nature of reality—which they do on the Christian view of God—then as investigators in these different realms we become nothing less than co-operators with God, workers along with Him, for the realization of His purposes in the world. In particular, if the heart of the universe is properly described, as it is according to Christian theology, as Love or Father-love, the great end and aim of all thought and life is the realization of a Community of Love and Service in which all men and nations are called to have their part.

Spiritual Problems and the War.

II. Christian Loyalties.

By the Reverend H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D., Principal of Regent's Park College, Oxford.

1. 'Loyalty' and 'legality' are words which grow from the same root, yet differ in character as much as children of the same parents ever can. 'Legality' means conformity to an external code of law; 'loyalty' suggests an inner spring of devotion, whose free flow will carve out its own channels. In Bunyan's allegory, 'Mr. Legality' is an off-stage figure of eminent respectability, having one 'Civility' for his son, yet he is (so far as religion is concerned) bluntly called a cheat. Loyalty, however, is described, by one who knew better than any the perils of legalism, as the love which is the fulfilment of the law (Ro 13^{10}).

The supreme Christian loyalty is as simple and inevitable as anything could be. It characterizes the response of faith to Jesus Christ, showing itself not as a duty, but as an instinct, of the new life. The vision of God in Christ derives its compelling authority from its own intrinsic character. The loyalty that responds to that vision is as spontaneous as the emotion of gratitude aroused in us by some generous and unexpected kindness. The poetry of the response is akin to the poetry of the gospel that wakes it. Loyalty transforms the statutes of religion into songs. Loyalty cannot be awakened by the paradoxical command 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,' for who can command an emotion? But it *is* awakened when the father goes on to tell his questioning son how lovable is this God, 'who brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand' (Dt 6^{21}). Loyalty, like every other deep emotion, instinctively seeks some outlet and utterance. The inner spirit must issue in some outer and visible expression, some characteristic 'way of life'. It is notable that the earliest distinctive name to denote the followers of Christ was 'those of the Way' (Ac 9^2 19^9 $24^{14.\ 22}$). Christian loyalty will always seek and find three 'ways' of expression—a way of living, a way of service, and a way of interpretation of the world. In its way of living (at the highest) there will be something characteristic, something of the kind that made Francis of Assisi a living gospel and led Moody to say of Henry Drummond, 'Never have I known a man who, in my opinion, lived nearer the Master, or sought to do His will more fully.' The new-found loyalty of St. Francis found immediate expression in a way of service; the crucifix of St. Damien called him to repair its ruined chapel. William Carey challenged his fellows to what was (for them) a new type of service, by his book, 'An Enquiry into the obligation of Christians to use means for the conversion of the heathen.' Schweitzer, unsatisfied by his music and his theology, flung himself into medical work in the primæval forest, as a more adequate actualization of personal loyalty.[1] Yet theology, too, can be an expression of loyalty, and none would deny this in an Aquinas and a Calvin. The acceptance of Christ's centrality in the universe always implies a new interpretation of it for those who think. Living, serving, and interpreting all belong to the vital language of Christian loyalty, and none of them can be neglected with impunity, when capacity and opportunity open the 'Way'.

2. Such loyalty, it is clear, can never be actualized in a vacuum. It must have something to work on, and that something will be drawn from its environment. The environment may be alien or friendly; Christian loyalty may encounter a challenge to fight, or an appeal for help—this none the less real because often implicit, and unconscious. Both relations will usually be involved at once, through the complexity of social life. The *milieu* in which Christian loyalty was born was both friendly and hostile, for contemporary Judaism had many varieties. The personal loyalty to God which the prophets had striven to evoke was continued in those men and women who found their way to God opened by Jesus of Nazareth. Sooner or later this was bound to oppose that other loyalty to God, which found its best medium in obedience to

[1] We may think of the famous epitaph which Aeschylus is said to have written for his own monument, which tells how he fought at Marathon, but is silent as to his tragedies.

the Jewish Law. Similarly, the Roman Empire supplied a more external environment to Christian loyalty which could be either friendly or hostile. It was friendly when the Roman soldiers preserved the social order that made possible the life and work of Jesus, and hostile when Jewish prejudices made them the instruments of His crucifixion. It was friendly when the Apostle Paul could claim the protection of his Roman citizenship and appeal to Cæsar, or when he could declare the Roman power to be a minister of God; it was hostile in the persecution of Christians by Nero and Domitian. The history of the long struggle between the Empire and the Church has been set forth on the large scale by Mr. C. A. Cochrane in his recent book, *Christianity and Classical Culture*. In the eyes of Christian thinkers, he says, the Græco-Roman order was based on a classic 'naturalism' irreconcilable with an order based on the interpretation of the world through the revelation in Christ. Eventually, however, as we all know, the Empire accepted, at least in name and form, the faith of the Church, and became the patron of Christianity. Through every form of environment it remains true to say, with a Swedish thinker,[1] 'If you wish to have Christ, you must take history with Him.' Any attempt to frame a theology on a dualistic contrast between Christianity and 'culture' is doomed to ultimate failure. Opposition to a particular form of culture may be forced on the Church in particular generations, as it is to-day, so far as the 'Kultur' of Nazidom is concerned. But such a phase is temporary, and there is to-day also a Christian civilization, much more aware of its vital values because of the challenge which it has to meet. That Christian civilization, whatever its deficiencies, owes its best features to the slowly exerted influences of the Christian faith. The liberty, justice, and human kindliness for which we fight to-day owe far more than most men realize to the new value given to human personality by many generations of loyalty to Christ. The children may not discern their parents, but the parents ought to avow their children, and greet them with something like the Master's word, 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.'

3. But life is much more complex than all this might suggest. The Christian is not living entirely in a closed fellowship of those who share his loyalty to Christ, surrounded by an uncharted sea, on which are the flotsam of individual loyalties to the values for which he stands, loyalties as yet unconscious of their implicit allegiance. The values visible in his extra-ecclesiastical environment are linked to various forms of community life. Some of the most sacred and intense loyalties spring up within the narrow group of the family, even though its narrowness may also generate selfish isolation from larger interests. Patriotism remains a genuine form of loyalty, even though we have to say of it, as well as of liberty, 'What crimes have been wrought in thy name!' The circle of personal friendships, the code of professional honour, the scheme of social welfare which we actively support, will all set up loyalties of their own, not easily comprehended within the primal loyalty to Christ, and often leading to a direct clash and a painful perplexity. Is a son or daughter to sacrifice a future career, perhaps of wide usefulness, in order to give present support or service to parents? Can a vague internationalism ever hope to replace the intensity of nationalism as the cradle of public-spirited devotion to duty? Ought I to deal with my friend, even though I believe him to be in the wrong, with the cold-blooded impartiality of a judge upon the bench? The clash of loyalties that arise in these and other ways is vividly illustrated in Galsworthy's well-known play, *Loyalties*, where we see personal friendship and human pity struggling against abstract justice. The particular clash of loyalties which arises for the Christian pacifist, convinced that his loyalty to Christ forbids the use of force even in defence of the values of Christian civilization, is no isolated instance. It belongs to a whole group of situations inseparable from the very texture of life. We cannot resolve their difficulties by any generalization, for they spring from infinitely varied and concrete personal relationships. We cannot, in the last resort, prescribe to another man his duty, for any such prescription lacks the essential element in duty, which is acceptance by the individual conscience. We can only say, as the present Prime Minister finely said of his predecessor, from whose course of action he had so widely disagreed, 'The only guide to a man is his conscience. The only shield to his memory is the rectitude and sincerity of his actions . . . with this shield, however the Fates may play, we march always in the ranks of honour.'

4. But, though we cannot settle individual decisions by any generalizations, there are certain general considerations which conduce to clearer thinking, and may save us in that way from misguided decisions, amongst which I count

[1] Söderblom, *The Nature of Revelation*, 171.

Pacifism. First amongst these, we may set the dangers of an impossible literalism in the acceptance of the teaching of Jesus. However splendid and efficacious the literalism of Francis of Assisi in his imitation of the circumstances of the human life of his Lord, we all draw distinctions in practice, and know that we must draw them. Thoughtful Christians recognize that the Cross of Christ means far more than the Sermon on the Mount, and that it is the spirit of cross-bearing that is the essential standard of Christian loyalty, according to the Lord Himself. We recognize in practice, whatever our theory, the truth of the remark made by the biographers of Robertson Smith[1] 'Compromise, foreign as it is both to religion and to science, is of the very essence of all politics.' We could not enter into any social organization, whether it be ecclesiastical or secular, without some compromise of individuality; it belongs to the very recognition of the right of conscience in the other man. We have to admit the existence of different levels of life, besides that of a chosen group of disciples living in a particular phase of social order. On the vexed question of the Christian use of force, for example, we ought to take into account, I think, that Nature is God's and that on *that* level force is one of His methods. To recognize this does not, of course, exonerate the Christian from loyal striving to replace force by moral persuasion, and to lift the world to the higher level of the Lord's ways. But it does help him to see the larger background of God's rule of the world in Nature and history; it does contribute to an outlook like Wordsworth's. in reaction from the 'monstrous ant-hill' of London life, *i.e.* the view of:

> him who looks
> In steadiness, who hath among least things
> An under-sense of greatest; sees the parts
> As parts, but with a feeling of the whole.[2]

It is instructive to remember that there are 'second causes' in morality as well as in Nature. We cannot revive the relative simplicity of the Hebrew view of Nature, as directly administered by God's hand; we have learnt how many links there are in the chain of cause and effect, in the most trivial or the most overwhelming phenomenon of the physical order, how many 'second causes'. So is it with the moral and spiritual order, as anthropology and psychology and economics have taught us in recent years. The Christian will not, indeed, stop where many an anthropologist or psychologist or economist chooses to stop, indeed must stop, because of the limits of his science. But Christian loyalty to the divine purpose, as seen in Christ, ought to include everything on a lower level that can be made a stepping-stone to the higher loyalty, in kinds of service to the welfare of the world which are not the highest, and yet may be the highest possible at that stage, or in that particular relation. If his particular vocation (including, as it does, the opportunity and capacity which shape vocation) calls him to a service on what seems to him a higher level, nearer to the achievement of the divine purpose, he will not look down with disapproval or condemnation on those who are serving God at what seems to him a lower level (in which judgment he may often be wrong). If he does so disapprove, he runs the risk of profiting himself by that which he disavows, like the man who enjoys the protection of a State which he will not defend as its citizen.

In the light of these considerations I do not think it is wise or right to speak of some of the difficult decisions which Christian loyalty is often called to make as 'a choice of evils'. That which is a genuine contribution to the Kingdom of God is never an evil, though the means employed, such as war, is certainly an evil thing when employed in the service of ambition, aggression, and tyranny. We need to think out more thoroughly the principles underlying our often instinctive actions. We need, also, more realism in our Christian thinking, if the Church is to make an effective contribution to the new order of the post-war world. It is not enough to cherish high ideals of the kind of world in which all men would be loyal to Christ, and to cherish those ideals in a separated community apart from the world. We must accept the conditions of the world as it is, if only in order to lift it to something better. Those conditions are not divorced from God's control. In the grounds of the college where this is written there is a sundial, with two Hebrew inscriptions. That to the East says, 'Light rises in darkness for those of the straight path.' It is a divine promise, which guarantees the individual conscience. The Western inscription is 'The sun knoweth his going down.' That is a reminder of the divinely fixed inevitabilities, within which man goeth forth to his work and to his labour until the evening.

[1] J. S. Black and G. Chrystal, *The Life of William Robertson Smith* (1912), 363.

[2] *Prelude*, vii. 733–736.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Parachute and the Baby.

By the Reverend S. Greer, M.A., Ayr.

'He would not drink thereof.'—2 S 23^{16}.

An airman of the last war, after a gallant fight with the enemy, found his 'plane was getting out of control. He knew it was going to crash. So he prepared to jump, his silk parachute fastened about his waist. Counting ten, to make sure he was free of the 'plane, he pulled the cord, and the parachute opened. His headlong descent was halted, and from rushing up at him the earth began to float slowly toward him. Houses, trees, cattle were nearer now. Presently he found himself looking for a spot on which to land. Then a sudden jolt, and the field came up and hit him. Tossed about for a moment he soon picked himself up; his wrecked 'plane he saw a short distance away.

That silk parachute had saved his life. He kept it after the war; it was a lovely shimmering thing. What would he do with it? Then suddenly he knew. His baby boy was soon to be baptized in church. He would have a christening-robe made out of it for his little son. So, wrapped about in the silk which had saved the father's life, that baby was presented to God.

Wasn't that a lovely idea? There were many things that airman could *not* have done with that precious silk. He could not have employed it for his own use, to make a garment for himself. You see, some things are much too valuable to be kept to oneself.

In the Bible we read about King David's men who brought him a cup of water which they had risked their lives to get for their leader. 'And he would not drink thereof.' He felt it would be a sin just to quench his thirst with water which might have been so dearly bought; for those gallant men might have perished in getting it for him. You remember what he did? He could not use it for himself; instead he presented it to God.

Yes, there are things which are much too precious to be used selfishly, or spent meanly. You feel that about our life in these days of war, don't you? Our life, our liberty, our right to say what we believe are dearly bought by brave men whose peril is the price of our safety. Should we not all make up our minds that we should pay for this happiness? And that is why, as some one says, 'if it's worth our being alive at all, we've got to be especially kind, unselfish, and brave.' You feel there's nothing you can do, when every one else is so eagerly busy? It is not true. By sweetness of temper, by stopping all grousing, which is just selfishness, you can be a great help to others. You can radiate a cheerfulness and courage that will hearten them, and in this way thank them for your happiness.

Think of the wonderful life God has given you. We can run and play games; we have powers of thought and imagination; we can love, and we can follow a leader. It is a glorious life, made rich by the sacrifice of Jesus. We must not spend it selfishly, or give the strength of our mind to mean things, or bestow our loyalty on unworthy things. We must not cheapen what cost so dear. God wants us to get the best out of life, and make the most of it. Then let us pray this prayer: 'Lord Jesus, who hast given me so much, and loved me so dearly, help me always to follow Thee.'

Feeding the Multitude: A Modern Miracle.

By the Reverend Frank Duckworth, M.A., Leeds.

'Give ye them to eat.'—Lk 9^{13}.

If you had lived in Galilee many years ago, and had asked the people what was the most wonderful thing they had ever seen, they might have told you how Jesus once fed a great crowd of people with a little lad's lunch. When the disciples pointed out to Jesus that all the people, who had been following Him and listening to Him throughout the day, were tired and hungry, He told them to go ahead and feed all these hungry folk. While they were looking helplessly at each other, and wondering what to do, a little boy came along and offered the food which by God's help was multiplied many times, and proved enough for all the crowd. That was a long time ago; but the same kind of miracle happened only the other day.

A little Chinese boy who lived in Manila, in the Philippine Islands, was saving up to buy a bicycle; and when he had saved about three pounds, he decided there was something he wanted even more than a bicycle—and that was to help the Chinese people who were suffering so terribly in their own country, because of the way Japan was smashing

their homes and ruining their farms. He knew that many of these poor folk were starving, and he decided that he had better do something about it. So he went to a bakery, and spent all the money that he had saved on sacks and sacks of bread. Then he dragged and carried the sacks to the offices of the China Relief Committee. The officers on that committee were very surprised to see all this bread, and they wondered what in the world they were going to do with it. They didn't want to hurt the little chap's feelings by telling him that if they tried to send it to China it would be stale and bad long before it got there. So at last they decided to call it 'Patriotic Bread,' and sell it again to the people in the Chinese schools in Manila. It was amazing how quickly it was bought—at the end of the day the little boy's three pounds had grown to ten. 'This is a great idea,' said the committee; and they bought more bread, and tied labels to it, telling that it was Patriotic Bread again. The Chinese women of Manila sold it outside the shops and theatres; and after three days the three pounds had grown to three hundred, and this great sum was sent to China in the name of the little boy.

But the story isn't finished yet. An American lady returned from Manila to the United States, and she told this story to a great many people. Amongst those who heard it were Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ford. Mrs. Ford said, 'Somehow I can't help feeling sorry that the little boy didn't get the bicycle for which he had worked so hard. I want to give it him.' She sent twenty dollars to Manila, and asked the China Relief Committee to find the boy, and arrange for him to be presented with the bicycle at a great public ceremony, attended by all the important people of the town. The wife of the American Commissioner made the presentation; and the little Chinese boy was so shy that he forgot the speech that he had been learning for the great day. But he didn't forget to send a letter to Mrs. Henry Ford, thanking her for her kindness. He said in the letter that he realized now that he had made a mistake in thinking that all the bread he had bought could be sent direct to China. But he still wanted as much as ever to help the poor people in China, and so he had decided to rent the bicycle for two shillings an hour, and send all the money to the relief fund.

We hear now that that bicycle is supporting a Christian home in China for fifty orphan boys. And every word of this story is true!

If anybody tells you that miracles don't happen in these days, just you tell them that they are wrong; tell them this story.

The Christian Year.

First Sunday after Epiphany.

Consecration.

'Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ.'—Ro 1[1].

'He has had the whole of me.' So said General Booth, towards the end of his days, of Jesus Christ, his Lord and Master. It is a big thing to be able to say. Many of us spend precious years resisting Him to the uttermost, yielding ground inch by inch, till we fall back on our last citadel and surrender. But, wherever we see the man who is wholly Christ-possessed, the spectacle is always profoundly impressive. If ever there was a Christ-dominated life it was that of St. Paul. The only designation he would own, the only title of which he was proud, was—'Paul, a servant (a bond-slave) of Jesus Christ.' How easily the phrase slips over our tongue when we read it in his letters. Yet, if we have any spiritual imagination at all, we discover that there is far more in it than appears on the surface.

Two thoughts arise in our minds as we brood on it. Is it not an amazing thing that Saul of Tarsus should be any one's servant? If ever a man was born to command, it was this man. Wherever he appears among his fellows, he simply towers over them. At first, the order may be 'Barnabas and Paul,' but soon it is 'Paul and Barnabas.' You would have said that the last place in the world Saul would have occupied would have been that of an underling, a subordinate, a bond-slave. But it was in this rôle that the proud man came to make all his boast. He could say, with perfect confidence, 'It is no longer I that live, but Christ that liveth in me.' There is no such instance in history of the subjugation of one personality by Another.

But there is more matter for wonder in Paul's title. That he should be any one's servant is remarkable, but that he should be the servant of Jesus Christ is the crowning wonder. Jesus Christ seemed to set at naught everything sacred and dear in the Jewish tradition, which was in Saul's very blood. In the intensity of his hatred he hounded innocent folk to their death. In fact, this is no common indignation. The white heat of it makes one suspicious. It needs explaining. The young man, at whose feet these rancorous Jews laid their clothes while they stoned Stephen to death, must have asked himself some pointed questions. 'What kind of religion is it that needs to bolster up its

beliefs by cruelties like this? And, on the other hand, what kind of religion may this Christian faith be, after all, that it can carry its believers through suffering like this of Stephen's—" his face like the face of an angel, the words of serene forgiveness on his dying lips "? ' They say that, in the Alps, the loosening of a pebble will bring down a mighty avalanche. Something like this happened on the Damascus way. Something came down upon Saul of Tarsus that engulfed and overwhelmed him and, from that moment, ' Christ had the whole of him.'

Taking a broad view of the Great Apostle's life, we can discover the working out of several great principles of Christian living. The first is, that God gives us *power* in terms of service. The purer our motives, the deeper our devotion to Christ, in that measure and with mathematical exactitude does the power of God flow through us into the lives of other men. Read the life of St. Paul; watch him on his perilous journeys—and the spectacle that rises before you is that of a man charged with a power that can be explained on no mere human terms. He is patently a God-empowered man. Which of us but has tried to picture to ourselves the sight of Paul preaching—' his bodily presence contemptible,' but the effect on his hearers profound, startling, electric. To enable ourselves to come near it, we may read a contemporary account of Abraham Lincoln's first appearance in an important gathering in New York. The writer described the great liberator's lean face and awkward mien, his big hands, his ill-fitting, badly wrinkled clothes, his large ears, uncouth gestures, and provincial accent. ' When I first saw him I said to myself, " Old fellow, you won't do. This may be all very well for the Wild West. It will never go down in New York." But very soon, he seemed to catch fire. The whole man was transfigured. I forgot his clothes, his peculiarities, his personal appearance, and I was on my feet like the others, cheering to the echo, when he reached his climax amid thunders of applause. A friend asked me, " What do you think of Abraham Lincoln, the backwoodsman? " I said, " He is the greatest man since St. Paul." '

Such a picture is valuable, because it helps us to see a great principle at work—God clothing Himself with a personality outwardly unattractive and becoming irresistible over the wills of men. If the sense of futility and powerlessness lies heavy on us the fault is our own. We are straitened in ourselves, never in God. The measure of our desire to serve is the measure of God's willingness to empower.

The love of God flows just as much
As that of ebbing self subsides.
Our hearts, their scantiness is such,
Bear not the conflicts of these rival tides.

The second principle is, that God gives us *guidance* in terms of service. Phrases occur and recur, in Paul's letters, which show this principle at work. He is ' led by the Spirit ' or ' the Spirit suffered him not ' or he ' journeys by revelation.' Everywhere and always, one gets the sense of a man moving unerringly to destined ends, over God-appointed paths. Paul had but one ambition—to do the will of God—and he was serenely confident that God would work together with him in that direction. What shining self-effacement and devotion are here, that can say of his privations—' None of these things move me '—so long as they were the means by which the gospel of Jesus sped on its healing mission to the hearts of men. Paul felt that nothing that happened to him was lost. Everywhere he turned his necessity to glorious gain. If one door closed, another opened. Standing out all over Paul's career, so that he who runs may read, is this eternal law of Christian service—the purer the motive, the surer the guidance.

Here is a principle that sheds light on these dubious, faltering lives of ours. Why is it that so much of our youth is spent in reactions and revulsions, in laying down in disenchantment what we took up in exultation? Why is it that we are up against a hard, intractable element in life, which we would fain mould nearer to our heart's desire and somehow cannot? Is it not just because we have not discovered Paul's secret, that to be strong and confident and adequate to life, we must first be mastered by a Power and a Person greater than ourselves, who takes our destiny out of our own hands, and daily empowers, guides and enlarges us?

Into His hand went mine,
Into my life came He.
He leads me now in ways divine,
In ways I feared to see.

Lastly, God gives us *self-realization* in terms of service. When first we meet Saul of Tarsus he is pressing eagerly on his way to an earthly eminence from which nothing human could have kept him. But something miraculous happened on the Damascus way, whereby Saul of Tarsus became Paul the Apostle. How unlike the life he had anticipated for himself was this new world of thought and action, and how much greater! Self-

effacement in a great cause became self-enlargement, as it always does.

In that loveliest of European cities, Budapest, there is a famous statue. The Hungarians speak of it lovingly and familiarly as 'Old Anonymous.' The legend is that, long ago, a learned monk wrote a chronicle of his native land, and so rescued from oblivion the history of two hundred years. To this day, no man knows his name. The sculptor has cunningly graven the lesson in stone. In the public square sits the faithful monk, his book on his knee, open for all to behold as it lies in the sunlight, but most of his face is covered by the monk's cowl, so that, the brighter the sunshine, the darker the shadow that hides his features. The man's work is everything, himself nothing.

That man alone is great, as God counts greatness, whom He has empowered and guided and enlarged. For the only true greatness is the greatness that has learned to serve.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Will of God.

BY THE REVEREND G. PARRINDER, B.A., B.D., REDRUTH.

'Thy will be done.'—Mt 6^{10}.

These familiar words from the Lord's Prayer are often used in difficult circumstances, with an expression of resignation, as if the will of God were something harsh or disagreeable. In time of sickness many will apply remedies and call in the doctor; at last, when all else has failed, they will resort to prayer and cry despairing—'Thy will be done.' The thinking Christian will begin with prayer, and all his efforts towards healing will be based upon the knowledge that it is not the will of God that men should die prematurely. He will see that his Master sought to fulfil the divine will by healing disease, and he will recognize that if he is unable to cure sickness it may well be due to human ignorance which time may remove.

Many nominal Christians, however, have accepted, often unconsciously, the current pagan notions of fatalism. Some unknown and unmoral destiny has decreed our misfortune, and our efforts to escape are like the futile squirms of ants on a hot plate. 'Stay around and they will get you,' is the unhappy conclusion of Hemingway's *Farewell to Arms*.

Now, living religion, as distinct from stoicism or moralism, is based upon belief in a *personal* God.

[1] G. J. Jeffrey, *Christian Intimacies*, 164.

Indeed (*pace* Julian Huxley) there is no religion possible without such a belief. God has a definite will towards His worshipper. But the nature of His personality, and consequently of that will, is understood in a variety of ways.

Primitive man knows the will of his god; it is dangerous and evil. If a tornado strikes his hut, or his children are smitten by disease, he hastens to answer the will of his god by gruesome sacrifices so that the deity may be appeased—and go away. The Muhammadan knows the will of his god too; it is an unrelenting destiny. Whatever happens, good or ill, is God's will. In the last resort it is blasphemy to seek to avoid such a will by taking medicine; if God wills it, the sick man will recover; if God wills the contrary, he will die.

Our attitude towards the will of God is conditioned by our conception of the *character* of God. Our emotions, when we ask that God's will be done, differ very much according as we regard God's character to be revealed in arbitrary or relentless will, or whether we regard that character as loving and God's will to be directed towards the welfare of His children. The Christian does not worship the god of the trembling fetisher; he does not believe with Joshua that God commands the massacre of entire cities, or wi h Muhamm d that the sovereign will of God must be honoured by using the sword as chief instrument of conversion. The Christian worships the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It is Jesus who tells us to pray that God's will be done. In His day Jesus found that men were afraid; how often does He tell them not to fear, and that His Father cares for the very smallest of His creatures. In the teaching of Jesus God's nature is fatherly and His will is good. Even the fatherhood of God is not left undefined, since the character of fathers may vary; God is the loving father of the prodigal. We ourselves can qualify the divine character still further, since we have seen Jesus, and we may affirm that the God and Father of our Lord is Christlike.

It follows that when the Christian prays, 'Thy will be done,' he is not cringing in fear or bowing to the inevitable in stoical spirit. He is giving himself in joyous confidence to the gracious will of a Father whom he knows to be loving. His worship will not be a commercial transaction or an effort to escape the divine will, it will be joy and communion.

The will of our Father is gracious, and it is so for all men, irrespective of class or colour. If we base our theology upon this view of the divine

character and purpose we shall avoid the error of some preachers of past centuries who declared that all men live in the state ordained for them by God, and that we must passively submit to this divine decree and 'stay put.' The Christian knows that he is a child of God, that God wills the best for him, and that he has the right of a son to a life worthy of his Father. A man born in the slums is not ordained to stay there; the will of God for him would be in his escape from slum-life—finally by the abolition of all slums.

In these days we are having to face up to the fact of evil. Evil thwarts God's will, temporarily; the Bible declares that it did so in Eden. God wills the best for His children, but that best may not be yet obtainable because of human folly. Man has the power to organize a happy world but squanders the divine gifts. God predestines all of us to good; this is the logical conclusion of the Epistle to the Romans. It is obvious that men both can and do thwart the divine predestination to good. The scapegoat of the moment, Adolf Hitler, may well illustrate this, for in him we see a man of undoubted genius who is certainly not pursuing the divine vocation but following a diabolical path.

The will of God is good, it demands the best for us and from us. This does not mean that life will be a bed of roses for us. As God's children, reconciled to His purposes, we share in His travail in the world. We know that nothing can separate us from Him, and that we can do all things through Him. Here is justification and strength enough for social reform, individual self-improvement, moral regeneration, and missionary enterprise.

The Christian praying, 'Thy will be done,' must realize what that implies, both as regards the divine character and his own way of serving God. We may illustrate this from the experience of John Wesley. Wesley was 'converted' at the age of thirty-five. Yet from his youngest days he had always endeavoured to be a saint and few men can ever have surpassed him in the quantity of his good works. He rose at four in the morning, spent hours in prayer, Bible study, and study of foreign languages. He visited the sick in the foul hospitals of the eighteenth century; he visited the still more foul prisons; he rode on the tumbrils with condemned criminals to the place of execution and prayed with them in the last hours amid the jeers of the barbarian crowds. And yet this man was not 'converted'! What difference could conversion possibly make to him? Wesley himself tells us of the difference, and it lies not in the number of his good works, for it would have been physically impossible to increase them; the secret was in his understanding of and relationship to the will of God. Before his conversion Wesley says that he had served God as a servant, he was afraid of Him, he sought justification by works. He was converted by realizing that God loved him, that Christ had died for him. His faith was that of a son, and spontaneously and joyously he now performed his Father's will.

So shall we say, 'Thy will be done,' in happy acceptance when we recognize that God loves us and wills the best life for His children. The prodigal will return to find true happiness at home. He will hear the loving Father's voice, as Francis Thompson heard it, saying:

All which I took from thee I did but take,
Not for thy harms,
But just that thou might'st seek it in My arms.
All which thy child's mistake
Fancies as lost, I have stored for thee at home:
Rise, clasp My hand, and come!

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Christian Optimism.

'We know that all things work together for good to them that love God.'—Ro 8^{28}.

Is this mere vague optimism on St. Paul's part, or does it rest on a solid basis of fact? The optimist is sometimes too fond of indulging in vague sentimental generalities. He shuts his eyes to inconvenient facts while he repeats the unreal formula that everything is for the best in this best of all possible worlds. St. Paul's assertion is far more precise than this: it is carefully limited and strictly defined. He does not, indeed, offer any arguments to prove it. Perhaps it was to him rather an intuition than an inference. At any rate, whether self-evident or derived from experience, he 'knows' that it is true. And not merely does he know this himself: those brethren at Rome to whom he is writing, though he is as yet personally unacquainted with them, know it also. 'We know,' he writes—we Christians know—'that *to them that love God* all things work together for good.' There are two points in particular which seem to come out, as we think about his words.

(1) Men often find it difficult to see any continuous purpose running through their lives as a whole. The various experiences which befall them seem to them inconsistent and antagonistic, sometimes distinctly helping forward, and sometimes as distinctly retarding their own immediate

aims and ambitions. 'One moment brings a message which the next moment seems to contradict.' As applied to some lives, this statement may perhaps be thought exaggerated, but many people will feel that there is truth in it. Men are often really unable to see any unity of purpose or providential direction in life, and this is the cause of much restlessness and unsettlement in their minds. They are led to look upon life as a riddle, a jest, a mockery. How can it be otherwise? If we put a loving and a loved God entirely out of the question, life is bound to become a combination of jarring elements. St. Paul's conviction is that to them that love God this sense of discordance and instability in life ceases to exist.

(2) There is another difficulty about life which the Apostle seems to have had in his mind—the difficulty which is caused by the existence of evil. St. Paul does not try to minimize the reality of evil in the world. He feels what every thoughtful man must feel about the suffering which pervades both Nature and human nature. He does not suppose that Christians will be rendered insensible or indifferent to suffering by having the love of God in their hearts. Still less does he suppose that a special Providence will interfere to protect them from the consequences of the evil which lies around them in the world. But he holds the belief that their love of God has the power not merely of disarming these consequences, but also of transforming them into something positively good. To them that love God all things—even evil things—work together *for good*. St. Paul seems to mean that the result of their working together will be not so much happiness as moral goodness. The painful experiences of life will not necessarily be less painful, but there will run through them all a spiritual education, a spiritual profiting, which will make the Christian who undergoes them a better man. Perhaps it might even be said that they will probably make him a happier man also.

Let us try to get a little deeper down into the heart of the text. What is the principle at work? How can the love of God dwelling in a man force each incident of his experience to help forward his moral and spiritual development? An interesting explanation of St. Paul's idea has been suggested. It is this. Love of God necessarily involves love of goodness. Now, if a man yearns after goodness, every experience will bring him only what stimulates goodness; he will find a suggestion and ministry of goodness in everything that befalls him. His hunger and thirst after righteousness will find in every event and incident their spiritual satisfaction. Whatever a man constantly and predominantly demands from life, that he will eventually get out of life.

Of the truth of this principle we can, most of us, satisfy ourselves from our own observation. Have we not often noticed how differently the various experiences of life, its joys and its sorrows, affect different individuals? One man will be nerved by a disappointment to a nobler effort; another, smarting under a sense of failure, will give up the struggle. Prosperity, which brings out all that is good in one man, will be fatal in its moral consequences to another. Some great sorrow or bereavement which sweetens and purifies one man's nature will sour and harden another's. Perhaps there is not a single joy or a single sorrow which affects two people in precisely the same way. Now why is it that these common experiences affect us so differently? There can only be one answer to that. Their influence varies as our character varies. The mean or selfish man makes everything that happens to him minister to his meanness or selfishness. The noble nature comes out of the experience of joy or sorrow confirmed and strengthened in its nobleness. 'To the pure all things are pure, but to them that are defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure.'

Such are the facts on which St. Paul's assertion seems to be based. Those who love God confront a sorrow which would embitter and do moral harm to some one else, and because desire for what is good is supreme in them, it works out in increased goodness. They are touched by pain, and, though to them pain is pain still, yet their soul takes no hurt, but because it is full of love for God, becomes all the more loving towards God and towards man. Many of us probably have had the privilege of knowing intimately some strong, quiet, serene man or woman who takes the varying experiences of life without undue elation or depression, and by virtue of an indwelling love of God transforms them all into fresh opportunities of getting nearer to Him. If we have ever marked the presence of this power of turning evil to good either in ourselves or in any one else, then we have reached an assured conviction that St. Paul's words rest on real facts.

'If ye love me,' says Christ, 'keep my commandments.' There we have a test which we can apply to ourselves. In the soul's long ascent towards the perfect love of God there are many stages and degrees. We may not as yet have climbed very high. But this we know, that unless we are hating with all our soul the thing that is evil, the love of God and of Christ dwelleth not in us. There is

no other thing in the world except sin which makes this love impossible to us. All other kinds of evil may, if we use them rightly, result in drawing us more closely to God. That is the question which St. Paul asks himself a few lines after the words of the text. 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.'[1]

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Mystery of the Missing Day.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY, LEICESTERSHIRE.

'So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man.'—Jos $10^{13.14}$.

Joshua, too, was a 'praying General.' Let us see whether, wrapped up in the mystery of that famous prayer and its sequel, there is a secret which we would do well to share to-day.

Joshua is at Gilgal, in the Jordan valley. He has entered upon his conquest of the Promised Land. One day he receives a call from his allies the Gibeonites. Would he come at once to Gibeon? 'Slack not thy hand from thy servants. Come up to us quickly and save us.' He did so. By an almost superhuman effort he and his men made a forced march all night until, at dawn, they reached Gibeon. He saw at once that the situation was critical. There, on the hills around and in the valleys beneath, were five armies, the armies of the five kings of the Amorites. He took it all in at a glance. He saw that if he was to settle the matter of those five armies he must do so before nightfall. We think of Cromwell, that other 'praying General,' before the battle of Dunbar. 'We are upon an engagement very difficult,' he said, 'through which we cannot get without almost a miracle.' And as he watched the mists break over the hills of Dunbar he sent up his prayer: 'Like as the sun riseth, so shalt Thou drive them away!' And so did Joshua. There, 'in the sight of Israel,' he prayed: 'Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon!' And at once he set about doing his part in helping God to answer his prayer. Then began the race against the sun, up hill and down dale, until, when night did fall, and the sun did set, all was over and the victory won. 'And,' says the old chronicler, 'there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man!'

What really happened? Did the sun and moon literally stand still? The question was asked in a most interesting article by the Rev. C. Stanley Thoburn in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES a few years ago. 'To be sure,' writes Mr. Thoburn, 'it has been claimed on appeal to modern scientific authority that a whole day has been found missing at the time that Joshua lived.' Can any light be thrown upon the Mystery of the Missing Day?

In the article just mentioned Mr. Thoburn describes an experiment which he made. Having as far as possible identified the places, measured the distances and checked the times, Mr. Thoburn and a friend endeavoured to reconstruct the events of Joshua's battle of Gibeon on the spot and in their proper sequence. They did so on 23rd March 1935. They made the forced night march from Gilgal to Gibeon, and arrived at dawn at the very spot from which Joshua saw the sunrise on the brow of El-Jib. And then away they sped, up hill and down dale, in the footsteps of Joshua and his men, being pursued by the shadows and racing against time. And the conclusion to which they came was that only a man putting forth almost superhuman effort and consumed by an overmastering purpose could have done what Joshua accomplished in the time and made one day do the work of two.

'And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man.' Astronomically, perhaps not. But we are sadly impoverished unless, in the only sense in which it does matter to us, we can recapture the secret of the Missing Day. In its own way, and for its own day, this old 'Mystery Story,' tells us four things which are true on any day and for every day.

1. If you want a thing very much, so much that you are willing to pay the price, then, sooner or later, you will get what you want.

This law applies whether the end you are aiming at is good or bad, and whether the means to that end be fair or foul. I want a thousand pounds! In my case, I fear, that is a bit of 'wishful thinking.' But so did the other man. And he got what he wanted! Incidentally, he got caught! What is the difference between his 'wanting' and mine? Just this: he wanted that sum of money at all costs. I do not—at that price. Wanting a thing, and getting what you want, involves accepting the means as well. It is just a question of being ready and willing to pay the price, whatever it may be.

[1] H. G. Woods, *At the Temple Church*, 48.

Every victory has its price. Joshua wanted that victory so much that he was willing to pay the price of running that race against the sun and making one day do the work of two. What victory do we desire? The victory over self, over sin, over the huge army of the world's desires? That victory is ours if we want it so much that we are willing to pay the price. Repent, and believe the gospel! He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved!

2. We have, locked up within us, energies and powers of which we little dream, and which may never be released, unless the appropriate stimulus is applied.

Sometimes the stimulus is the impact of a sudden emergency, some new responsibility. Sometimes love will do it, or hope; sometimes fear or despair. But there they are, stored up within us, these slumbering reserves of energy waiting to be awakened. One day, some years ago, a lady well known to me heard a thud and a cry. A huge slab of stone from the quarries at Festiniog had fallen on top of her little girl and pinned her underneath it. She rushed to the spot and lifted the slab with her hands, as though it had been the most natural thing in the world, and released her little girl with her foot. It took the strength of two men in cold blood to move that slab. Where did she get the power from? It was there all the time, only it needed the stimulus of a sudden emergency to bring it out.

'After chasing the Amorites over only a portion of the distance,' says Mr. Thoburn, 'we were sufficiently exhausted to regard those Hebrews of Joshua's day with profound admiration.' It is surely not safe to say: 'I can't do this,' or 'It is not in me to do that.' How do we know? It is there, but we cannot 'get at it.' No, but God can. And in the gospel story we see this miracle at work. We see Jesus applying the stimulus, releasing the energies of quite ordinary people, extending their personalities, multiplying their possibilities. A look from His eyes! A word from His lips!

He breaks the power of cancelled sin,
He sets the prisoner free!

3. When a man is really on the side of God and is doing the work of God, he is often helped by Forces that are beyond human.

The Sun stood still for Joshua and the Moon, 'for the Lord fought for Israel.' On the other hand, 'the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.'

It has often been observed and noted that when a really good man directs all his energies upon the doing of the will of God, that, sooner or later, all ends well. Even the difficulties and disappointments of good men are caught up into the purpose of God and turn out to be blessings in disguise. Think of some of God's great helpers like Paul of Tarsus, George Müller, Livingstone, Grenfell, Mary Slessor, how these men and women, often at their wits' end, with nowhere to turn, suddenly found that, apparently from nowhere, help had come. When a man is on God's side he finds that he is helped by forces that are not human at all. He is caught up in the current of that Stream of Tendencies, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness. And this applies in the life of nations and of communities, too. We have no business to be despondent about the future. No one, said somebody, can be a prophet who does not know history. The Bible is human history written from the standpoint of the Supernatural. There we see God at work in human affairs and in human lives. Read, for instance, the story of the Early Church. Not only the strength of men but their weaknesses, not only the martyrdoms but the murmurings—all were directed to one end, and 'all ended well.' If God be for us, who can be against us? It is not that Nature is violated. It is that the Supernatural overrules, and that God holds all things in His omnipotent hand.

4. Miracles of this order, it might be objected, do not happen because you cannot put into one day more than a day will hold. You can. You can put Eternity into it! And the point at which the eternal enters into time is the point which a man reaches when he comes to a decision. It is when a man cries out to the eternal God, and God answers. When you make up your mind, you make up your life. And when you make up your life, you make up your destiny. That is how much a day will hold. It will hold your salvation unto life eternal. And if any man, any day, makes that great decision, then he, too, will be able to look back and say: 'And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man.'

SEPTUAGESIMA.

Endurance.

'He endured, as seeing him who is invisible.'—Heb 11^{27}.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews gives more biographical details of the early days of Moses than are recorded in the Book of Exodus, for he tells us that Moses, who had been brought up in the Palace of Egypt and given royal status, identified

himself, when he had grown to manhood, with his enslaved people. He had been reared and educated as a prince, and yet he forsook 'the velvet course of fortune,' the luxury and prestige of his upbringing, to befriend the countrymen he loved. But in this self-sacrifice he must show tenacity of purpose if those serfs in the brick-kilns were to go free. He must endure in making their cause his own.

1. He endured rebuff. Moses met with an insolent rejection from the bondmen for whose emancipation he had stepped down from rank and comfort and ease. They made it clear that they did not wish this young lord to meddle with them, and repelled his generous intentions. One day Moses killed an Egyptian overseer, whom he caught flogging a Hebrew slave. The Government White Paper says of a German Concentration Camp: 'The Jews were sneeringly told by their guards that they were only experiencing the same treatment as their forefathers in Egypt, and that Pharaoh had not gone far enough.' Moses thought Pharaoh had gone too far, because Moses hated oppression. But the next day, when he rebuked one Hebrew who was oppressing another, he suddenly discovered that the Hebrews were so far from appreciating his chivalrous motives and aims, that they no longer deferred to him, but were ready to gibe at his authority and hint that he was not so safe himself now that he had the blood of an Egyptian official on his hands. This was how Moses' countrymen received his disinterested championship of their cause. The rebuff was so thankless and mortifying that it must have galled a spirited man like Moses. But he did not reply bitterly, because he trusted in a power working out of sight; he believed in God. Israel might not yet be ready for deliverance from bondage, the position had not reached breaking-point, the hour for action had not struck, and he must wait.

> Endurance is the crowning quality
> And patience all the passion of great hearts,

but no one has 'the crowning quality' which makes him a saving influence, without 'the passion,' the suffering love which bears the cross, till people shall be moved to change their mind and accept the proffered deliverance.

2. He endured delay. Moses' hopes had been dashed at the outset, but he did not abandon them. He had to leave the country and seek shelter among the quiet hills of Midian, because the liberation of his people was not practical politics meanwhile. It was part of his endurance that he could adhere to an ideal whose fulfilment seemed remote.

But it must have chafed the ardent spirit of Moses to rusticate amid the bucolic scenes of Midian, when the evil tyranny was still going on in the brickfields and slave-huts of Egypt. How he hated it! But he did not drop his project as hopeless. No, he took long views and proved himself capable of a long-term fidelity. He could endure delay, because he was sure that his hatred of oppression was God-instilled and would be God-fulfilled. He could hold out, because he was certain that his love of justice was not merely a brain-wave, an illusion of his own mind, which had no counterpart in reality, but had a Divine origin. The purpose God had begun in him God would complete. A man cannot last in the pursuit of such an ideal as that of Moses, unless he sees the invisible as his great command and support. His moral sense must be backed by some ultimate truth eternal to himself, some objective Otherness, and he must see God as the guarantee that such moral values as justice, honour, freedom, and goodwill are supremacies of the universe. It is religious faith that inspires confidence in certain moral standards, which are felt to be binding on all men as God's will for them. A better order of human society is likely only when people believe that the desire to do the straight, decent thing is not merely a sentiment characteristic of one person or nation but is a universal law inspired by God. Such a vision of the Divine Author and Ally of all good impulses is invaluable if there is to be a gallant persistence in what is felt to be right.

3. The long-distance task became an immediate demand. Moses did not endure in vain, for at length the formidable Rameses II., the Pharaoh of the oppression, died, and was succeeded by his son, Meremptah, and the hour of Israel's deliverance had come. The Hebrew bondmen were now so goaded to desperation that they would follow any leader who offered to sever the chain of their misery. After many years of delay, the favourable opportunity to liberate the enslaved people had arrived, the fortunate moment had come. The Italian Legion raised by Garibaldi in South America carried a black flag with a volcano in the centre, a symbol of Italy mourning with the sacred fire at its heart. The flame of vision had been burning in Moses' heart against a background of gloom, but he had waited through long years for it to burn in other hearts as well. That answering fire, the spirit of the downtrodden flaring up in the resolve to be free, had been so slow of coming that Moses could scarcely believe the message of the burning bush. Had it really happened at last? The heather

was on fire now, and Moses recognized in the burning bush on the hillside a symbol of the flame in the heart of the people; this was God telling him that the time to move had come, the long-distance task had become an immediate demand. The soul of Israel had been kindled by God. Moses saw the invisible as the befriending, saving God. Is not that the assurance we need when we are faced by some costly task, when we have to make some big choice, the full consequence of which we cannot foresee? We have long dreamed of it, it has been a sacred ideal for many years; yes, but what if we were unable to carry it through, what if it failed, and involved us and all we loved in suffering and destruction? No wonder Moses put that question to himself. But he went on because he saw that whatever the risk and whatever the sacrifice, the step forward must be taken, and the sacred fire at the heart of a mourning people would not prove fatal, because God was in this movement against tyranny.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews paid homage to Moses' endurance—why? Because it was a magnificent attitude of forgiveness for the rejection and insult meted out to his first approaches to a degraded people. It was persistence in self-effacement and self-sacrifice in spite of stinging memories. It was the patience which is 'the passion' of a great heart, the way of the Cross, and it cannot be explained except as a splendid insight into the forgiving character of God, a vision of His undiscouraged mercy, and a presage of what was revealed in Jesus Christ and Him crucified. 'He endured as seeing him who is invisible' and now he came to the rescue of those who had mocked him, for he was not ashamed to call them brethren. Gerald Gould writes:

> I loose my hold of silence and of song,
> And join the ragged ranks where I belong;
> Mix with the crowd of them that shun their fates,
> Poor, pitiful souls, that are my natural mates!
> Ah, how regain the morning, how control
> The lost, the hunted, and the haunted soul,
> Save by the light, the peace that made me see
> Even in the slave the spirit of the free!

Jesus Christ lived, died, and rose again to prove the dependable content of the unseen, which will bear our weight and never let us down in the enterprise for a more Christian civilization. When things look ugly for Christian ideals we venture to believe in the unseen God of love as our adequate support, because Jesus Christ has made us sure that such belief is not misplaced.[1]

[1] A. A. Cowan, *Captain of the Storm*, 17.

Entre Nous.

Pain.

'I am only trying to show that the old Christian doctrine of being made "*perfect through suffering*" is not incredible. . . . My own experience is something like this. I am progressing along the path of life in my ordinary contentedly fallen and godless condition, absorbed in a merry meeting with my friends for the morrow or a bit of work that tickles my vanity to-day, a holiday or a new book, when suddenly a stab of abdominal pain that threatens serious disease, or a headline in the newspapers that threatens us all with destruction, sends this whole pack of cards tumbling down.

'At first I am overwhelmed, and all my little happinesses look like broken toys. Then, slowly and reluctantly, bit by bit, I try to bring myself into the frame of mind that I should be in at all times. I remind myself that all these toys were never intended to possess my heart, that my true good is in another world and my only real treasure is Christ. And perhaps, by God's grace, I succeed, and for a day or two become a creature consciously dependent on God and drawing its strength from the right sources.

'But the moment the threat is withdrawn, my whole nature leaps back to the toys: I am even anxious, God forgive me, to banish from my mind the only thing that supported me under the threat because it is now associated with the misery of those few days. Thus the terrible necessity of tribulation is only too clear. God has had me for but forty-eight hours, and then only by dint of taking everything else away from me.

'Let Him but sheathe that sword for a moment and I behave like a puppy when the hated bath is over—I shake myself as dry as I can and race off to reacquire my comfortable dirtiness, if not in the nearest manure heap, at least in the nearest

flower bed. And that is why tribulation cannot cease until God either sees us remade, or sees that our remaking is now hopeless.' [1]

The Bread I ate with you was more than Bread.

In the form of short letters Rita F. Snowden writes on great things of life and religion—Love, the Incarnation, the Cross, Easter. The title that she gives to her book is *The Winds Blow*, and it is published by the Epworth Press at 3s. 6d. net. There is a fine use of imagination in these letters and a wealth of illustration. But it is easier to show what they are by quotation than by description. And so we quote from the one on first communion.

'DEAR JILL,—

'Many thank for your letter. So you are coming to your first communion. I am so glad.

'Can I tell you what this means to me? I will try. In my mind are some lovely words: "Music I heard *with you* was more than music, *And bread I ate with you was more than bread.*" Of course it was. You can think of some times, I am sure, when that has been true to you; when with your friend you have shared some simple meal, and it has been more than bread. Truly so!

'Away back in 1909 four men were making their way wearily back from the South Pole. They had been short of food for days, and one of their number was sick. All that they had was a little horse-flesh and a few biscuits. One morning the sick man, Commander Frank Wild, was so ill that he couldn't bear his horse-flesh. Then Shackleton did a glorious thing: he slipped into his companion's pocket his own morning's ration, one biscuit. The weary march went on, the others had no knowledge of what had happened; it was all done so quietly. But in his diary Wild wrote of it: "I do not suppose any one else in the world can thoroughly realize how much generosity and sympathy were shown in this. *But I do, and I shall never forget it.*" Only after the great explorer's death did he tell that to the world. To him it was a beautiful thing: you see, there are times when "the bread I ate with you was more than bread." It's the presence of one's friend, and the sympathy and the deep, real love of one's friend that makes it so. So is the bread and wine of this simple feast, to me. *The presence of my Friend makes it a sacrament.* . . . I come to this simple table to share this feast with my Lord, and because He is here, this "bread that I eat is more than bread." Studdert-Kennedy has the same wonderful thought expressed in a slightly different experience: he says, "If we picked a rosebud from a tree, it would be a rosebud and no more; but if the one we loved best in all the world plucked it and gave it, it would be a rosebud, and a great deal more; something spiritual would be added *because of the love behind the gift.* In this sense," he says—and adds the thought I have expressed—"the bread and wine we take at the Communion service are different from the food and drink we have in our own homes; *they carry a share of the love of our Lord who receives us at His table*".'

[1] C. S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain.*

Lebensraum.

'It is early one morning in February, and a group of pacifist and isolationist students have me "on the mat." They are emphatic in their denunciation of war and in the determination to keep America out of the present conflict. I suggest that there is a geographical aspect to their pacifism; if Hitler were in New York State, and had seized Massachusetts and Rhode Island, would not their pacifism be qualified? There was no reply. About this time I was told that Dr. James Moffatt dealt with characteristic shrewdness with an isolationist who spoke of the war as between two imperialisms and declared it would be well if it ended in a draw. Dr. Moffatt said, "Well, let us assume that is so, and Britain and France say to Germany, 'We are impressed by your appeal for *Lebensraum*. We will give you one of the British West Indies and one of the French'." "But you can't do that," said the outraged isolationist, "that would bring them on to our door-step!"' [2]

Books for the Troops.

'Please say nothing about my losses or some good Samaritan will forthwith send me odd numbers of the *Evangelical Magazine*—the pictures extracted; *Alleines Alarm* without the title page; an odd volume Charnock's sermons, etc. etc.' So Livingstone wrote in 1852 after he had lost his books.

[2] Dr. Peel in *The Congregational Quarterly*, October, 1940.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.